



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ON LIBRARIES



078669 8







Eng 118b





THE  
ENGLISH REVIEW.

---

VOL. VIII.

*SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER.*

---

NEW-YORK  
PUBLIC  
LIBRARY

LONDON:  
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,  
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.  

---

1847.



LONDON :  
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

W. W. W. W.  
W. W. W.  
W. W. W.

# CONTENTS

OF

No. XV.

---

ART.	PAGE
I.—Clément XIV. et les Jésuites, par J. Crétineau-Joly . . . .	1
II.—The Philosophy of Trade, or Outlines of a Theory of Profits and Prices; including an Examination of the Principles which determine the Relative Value of Corn, Labour, and Currency. By Patrick James Stirling . . . .	35
III.—1. Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis : Ecclesie Cathedralis Aberdonensis regesta que extant, in unum collecta. 2. Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1398—1570. 3. Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberden. 4. Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie, 1631—1654 . . . . .	50
IV.—1. Servia the youngest member of the European Family; or a Residence in Belgrade, and Travels in the Highlands and Woodlands of the Interior, during the years 1843 and 1844. By Andrew Archibald Paton, Esq. 2. A History of Servia and the Servian Revolution, translated from the German of Leopold Ranke. By Mrs. Alexander Kerr . . . . .	74

## CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE
V.—1.	<b>Tentativa Theologica. Episcopal Rights and Ultramontane Usurpations.</b> By Father Antonio Pereira de Figueredo, Priest and Doctor of Lisbon. Translated from the original Portuguese, with Notes, and some additional matter, by the Rev. E. H. Landon, M.A., Author of "A Manual of Councils."	
2.	<b>The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism, upon testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the First Six Centuries.</b> By Thomas William Allies, M.A., Rector of Launton, Oxon.....	106
VI.—1.	<b>Preachers, Pastors, and Bishops; or, an increased Ministerial Agency needed for the British Wesleyan Church.</b> By Benjamin Love, Author of "Records of Wesleyan Life."	
2.	<b>More Bishops, more Priests, more Deacons. How to increase the Efficiency of the Church.</b> A Sermon preached in the Church of St. Peter, Leeds, at the Visitation of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Craven, June 17th, 1847. By James Akroyd Beaumont, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Leeds.	
3.	<b>A Letter to Lord John Russell on Bishops.</b>	
4.	<b>A Letter on two present Needs of the Church, viz., Increase and Education of the Clergy.</b> Reprinted from Letters in the Guardian.	
5.	<b>A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P., on some Circumstances injurious to the Usefulness of the Established Church.</b> By Henry Stebbing, D.D., F.R.S.	141
	<b>Notices of Recent Publications, &amp;c.</b> .....	180
	<b>Foreign and Colonial Intelligence</b> .....	233



# CONTENTS

OF

No. XVI.

---

ART.	PAGE
I.—1. Sketches of Ireland Sixty Years Ago.	
2. Letters on the Condition of the People of Ireland. By Thomas Campbell Foster, Esq.	
3. The Case of the Church Education Society of Ireland, argued, in Reply to Charles Richard Elrington, D.D. By George Miller, D.D., Vicar-General of Armagh . . . .	257
II.—Annotations on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, designed chiefly for the use of Students of the Greek Text. By Thomas Williamson Peile, D.D., &c. &c. . . . .	277
III.—1. Concio ad Clerum Provinciæ Cantuar. In æde Paulina habita xix die Novembr. 1847 à Ricardo Gulielmo Jelf, S.T.P., Ædis Christi Canonico, necnon Collegii Reg. Londin. Principali, &c. Jussu Reverendissimi.	
2. The English Churchman, Thursday, Dec. 2, 1847.	
3. A Letter to Lord John Russell, M.P. On the bearing which the proposed admission of Jews into Parliament, the nomination of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, and other acts of Government, have on the Revival of Convocation. By the Rev. W. J. Trower, Rector of Wiston, Sussex, Rural Dean.	
4. Church Schools and State Interference. A Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. By George A. Denison, M.A., Vicar of East Brent, Prebendary of Salisbury, &c.	
5. Church Emancipation and Church Reform, in a Series of Letters addressed to the Churchmen of England. By Ecclesiastes. Reprinted from the "Morning Herald." . .	289

## CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
IV.—1. Minutes of several Conversations between the Methodist Ministers in the connexion established by the late Rev. John Wesley, A.M., at their one hundred and fourth Annual Conference, begun in Liverpool, on Wednesday, July 28, 1847.	
2. Narrative of the Proceedings and Resolutions of the United Wesleyan Committees of Privileges and Education, in reference to the recent Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education; with the Correspondence between the United Committees and the Committee of Council on Education, in March and April, 1847.	
3. A Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism; with Notes and an Appendix. By Edmund Grindrod .....	314
V.—1. The Apostolic Succession explained; a Short Treatise in which certain Theological questions of the day are calmly examined and resolved. By a Priest of the Order of Charity.	
2. The Unity of the Episcopate considered, in reply to the work of the Rev. T. W. Allies, M.A., entitled "The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism, upon Testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the first Six Centuries." By Edward Healy Thompson, M.A.	
3. Remarks on Certain Anglican Theories of Unity. By Edward Healy Thompson, M.A. ....	354
VI.—The Life of Mrs. Godolphin. By John Evelyn. Edited by the Bishop of Oxford .....	400
VII.—1. A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Remonstrance of the Bishops against the Appointment of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By the Right Rev. Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter.	
2. A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, &c. By the Rev. R. D. Hampden, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford .....	430
Notices of Recent Publications, &c. ....	456
Foreign and Colonial Intelligence .....	489

# INDEX

OF

## BOOKS REVIEWED.

\*.\* For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

*Aberdeen—Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis: Ecclesie Cathedralis Aberdonensis regesta quae extant, in unum collecta*, 50.

*Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1398—1570*, 50.

*Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen*, 50.

*Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie, 1631—1654*, 50.

*A Handbook for Visitors to Oxford*, 221.

*A Letter to Lord John Russell on Bishops*, 141.

*A Letter on two present needs of the Church, viz. Increase and Education of the Clergy. Reprinted from Letters in the "Guardian,"* 141.

*Allies—The Church of England cleared from the charge of Schism, upon testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the first Six Centuries.* By J. W. Allies, M.A. Rector of Launton, 106.

*An Answer to Dr. Wiseman's Letter.* By a Bachelor of Divinity, 487.

*Armstrong—The Pastor in his Closet; or a help to the Devotions of the Clergy.* By the Rev. John Armstrong, B.A., Vicar of Tidenham, 205.

*Bath and Wells—Charge by the Bishop of Bath and Wells*, 230.

*Beaumont—More Bishops, More Priests, More Deacons. How to increase the Efficiency of the Church. A Sermon*

*preached at Leeds, June 17, 1847.* By James Akroyd Beaumont, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Leeds, 141.

*Bennett—Apostacy, a Sermon.* By the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, M.A., 487.

*Boutell—Monumental Brasses and Slabs: an Historical and Descriptive Notice of the Incised Monumental Memorials of the Middle Ages; with numerous illustrations.* By the Rev. Charles Boutell, M.A., &c., 200.

*Chalmers—Posthumous Works of the Rev. T. Chalmers, D.D.* By the Rev. W. Hanna, 477.

*Chirol—A Statement of Facts.* By Alexander Chirol, 487.

*Church Emancipation and Church Reform, in a Series of Letters addressed to the Churchmen of England.* By Ecclesiastes, 289.

*Cicero—A Drama.* By the Author of Moile's State Trials, 229.

*Corrie—The History of the Reformation abridged from Burnet.* By George E. Corrie, D.D., 476.

*Crétineau Joly—Clement XIV. et les Jésuites,* par J. Crétineau Joly, 1.

*Denham—Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.* By the Rev. J. F. Denham, 485.

*Denison—Church Schools and State Interference. A Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone.* By George A. Denison, M.A. 289.

- Doane**—Bishop Doane's recent publications, 231.
- Dow**—Sermons by the Rev. W. Dow, 420.
- Eglise de Notre Dame de Bon-Secours pres Rouen**, 196.
- Elliott**—Four Sermons on Confirmation. By the Rev. W. Elliott, 231.
- Ellison**—Visitation Sermon. By the Rev. J. Ellison, 230.
- Emily Bathurst**; or, at Home and Abroad, 221.
- Enchiridion Juvenile**, 205.
- Evelyn**—The Life of Mrs. Godolphin. By John Evelyn, Esq.; edited by the Bishop of Oxford, 223. 400.
- Exeter**—A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Remonstrance of the Bishops against the Appointment of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By the Right Rev. Henry, Bishop of Exeter, 430.
- Fitzgerald**—Practical Sermons. By the Rev. W. Fitzgerald, B.A., 196.
- Foster**—Letters on the Condition of the People of Ireland. By Thomas Campbell Foster, Esq., 257.
- Fullwood**—Roma ruat. The Pillars of Rome are broken. By Fr. Fullwood, D.D.; edited by C. Hardwick, M.A. 464.
- Garbett**—Christ on Earth and in Heaven and on the Judgment-seat. By the Rev. J. Garbett, Rector of Clayton, &c., 196.
- Giles**—History of the Ancient Britons. By the Rev. J. A. Giles, D.C.L., 470.
- Glass-painting**—An Inquiry into the Difference of style observable in Ancient Glass Paintings, especially in England; with Hints on Glass Painting. By an Amateur, 200.
- Goodwin**—The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Life of St. Guthlac, Hermit of Crowland. By C. Wycliffe Goodwin, M.A., 468.
- Grindrod**—A Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism. By Edmund Grindrod, 314.
- Hampden**—A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, &c. By R. D. Hampden, D.D., 430.
- Hengstenberg**—The Christology of the Old Testament, and Commentary on the Messianic Predictions of the Prophets. By H. W. Hengstenberg, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Abridged (from the Translation of Dr. Reuel Keith.) By the Rev. T. K. Arnold, 180.
- Hoare**—Educational Statistics and Church Union. By Archdeacon Hoare, 230.
- Horst**—Paradise of the Christian Soul, enriched with choicest delights of varied piety. By J. W. Horst. Adapted to the Use of the English Church, 209.
- Hudson**—The History and Principles of the Book of Common Prayer practically explained. By the Rev. J. Hudson, 229.
- Irons**—Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. Parochial Lectures. (Third Series,) with a Preliminary Essay on the Teaching and Priestly Offices. By William J. Irons, B.D., &c., 206.
- Jelf**—Concio ad Clerum Provincia Cantuar. In æde Paulina habita xix die Nov. 1847 à Ricardo Gulielmo Jelf, S.T.P., 289.
- Keble**—Sermons, Academical and Occasional. By the Rev. John Keble, M.A., 474.
- Kennaway**—Sermons preached at Brighton. By the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, M.A., 196.
- Kerr**—A History of Servia and the Servian Revolution, translated from the German of Leopold Ranke. By Mrs. Alexander Kerr, 74.
- Laing**—Sermons, chiefly resulting from daily experience. By the Rev. David Laing, M.A., 196.
- Lord**—An Exposition of the Apocalypse. By David N. Lord, 189.
- Love**—Preachers, Pastors, and Bishops; or, an Increased Ministerial Agency needed for the British Wesleyan Church. By Benjamin Love, Author of "Records of Wesleyan Life," 141.
- Malan**—Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. By the Rev. S. C. Malan, 466.
- Madras**—Missionary Sermon. By the Bishop of Madras, 230.
- Manning**—Sermons. By Henry Edward Manning, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester, vol. iii. 196.
- Maskell**—Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; or, Occasional Offices of the Church of England, according to the ancient Use of Salisbury. The Primer in English, and other Prayers and Forms, with Dissertations and Notes. By the Rev. W. Maskell, M.A., 195.
- Massareene**—Church Melodies. By Viscount Massareene and Farard, 228.



*Massingberd—The English Reformation.* By F. C. Massingberd, M.A., 476.

*Merle D'Aubigné—The Protector: a Vindication.* By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D., 217.

*Miller—The Case of the Church Education Society of Ireland, argued, in Reply to Charles Richard Elrington, D.D.* By George Miller, D.D., 257.

*Minutes of Several Conversations between the Methodist Ministers in the connexion established by the late Rev. J. Wesley, M.A.,* 314.

*Moberly—Stories from Herodotus.* By Charles C. Moberly, B.A., 222.

*Montgomery—Poems.* By Mrs. Alfred Montgomery, 456.

*Montgomery—Religion and Poetry, being Selections from the Poetical Works of Robert Montgomery, with an Essay.* By Archer Gurney, 481.

*Narrative of Proceedings and Resolutions of the United Wesleyan Committees of Privileges and Education,* 314.

*Neale—A History of the Holy Eastern Church. The Patriarchate of Alexandria.* By the Rev. J. Mason Neale, M.A., &c., 213.

*Nicholson—Sermons.* By William Nicholson, M.A., 197.

*Norton—The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* By Andrews Norton, late Professor of Sacred History, Harvard College, 198.

*Ogilvie—Sermons before the University of Oxford.* By C. A. Ogilvie, D.D., 479.

*Olshausen—Biblical Commentary on the Gospels.* By Hermann Olshausen, D.D. Translated from the German by Dr. S. Loewe, 461.

*Paton—Servia the Youngest Member of the European Family; or, a Residence in Belgrade, and Travels in the Highlands and Woodlands of the Interior, during the years 1843 and 1844.* By Andrew Archibald Paton, Esq., 74.

*Peile—Annotations on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, designed chiefly for the Use of Students of the Greek Text.* By Thomas Williamson Peile, D.D., 277.

*Pereira—Tentativa Theologica. Episcopal Rights and Ultramontane Usurpations.* By Father Antonio Pereira de Figuere-do, Priest and Doctor of Lisbon. Translated from the original Portuguese, with Notes, and some additional matter, by

the Rev. E. H. Landon, M.A., author of a "*Manual of Councils*," 106.

*Puckle—Parochial Sermons.* By Rev. J. Puckle, 480.

*Reeves—Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor, and Dromore, consisting of a Taxation of those Dioceses compiled in the year mcccvi., with Notes and Illustrations.* By the Rev. W. Reeves, M.B., &c., 194.

*Robinson Crusoe—The Life and surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, mariner,* 221.

*Russell—Sermons.* By the Rev. Frederick Russell, 481.

*Schneider—A Complete Pocket Dictionary of the German and English Languages.* By F. W. C. Schneider, 470.

*Sketches of Ireland Sixty Years ago,* 257.

*Stebbing—A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P., on some circumstances injurious to the usefulness of the Established Church.* By Henry Stebbing, D.D., &c., 141.

*Stirling—The Philosophy of Trade; or, Outlines of a Theory of Profits and Prices; including an examination of the principles which determine the relative value of Corn, Labour, and Currency.* By Patrick James Stirling, 35.

*Stanley—Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age.* By Arthur P. Stanley, M.A., 478.

*Stuart—Sermon.* By Hon. and Rev. A. G. Stuart, 230.

*Sutton—The Evangel of Love interpreted* by Henry Sutton, 224.

*Sweet—Religious Liberty. The Church in Chains, &c.* By J. Bradby Sweet, M.A., 472.

*The Apostolic Succession Explained; a Short Treatise, in which certain Theological Questions of the day are calmly examined and resolved.* By a Priest of the Order of Charity, 354.

*The English Churchman,* 289.

*Trower—A Letter to Lord John Russell, M.P.* By the Rev. W. J. Trower, 289.

*Thompson—Remarks on Certain Anglican Theories of Unity.* By Edward Healy Thompson, M.A., 354.

—*The Unity of the Episcopate considered, in reply to the Work of the Rev. T. W. Allies, M.A., entitled "The Church of England cleared from the*

- Charge of Schism, upon Testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the first Six Centuries."* By Edward Healy Thompson, M.A., 354.
- Townsend—Ecclesiastical and Civil History philosophically considered.* By George Townsend, D.D., 477.
- Transactions of the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society*, 200.
- Vaughan—Sermons preached in the Chapel of Harrow School.* By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., 479.
- Wiseman—Conversion. A Letter to Mr. A. Chisol.* By N. Wiseman, D.D., 487.
- Woolley—Sermons in the Chapel of Rossall College, Fleetwood.* By Rev. Dr. Woolley, 479.

THE  
ENGLISH REVIEW.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1847.

---

ART. I.—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, par J. CRÉTINEAU-JOLY.  
Paris. 1847.

SOME time ago the *Ami de la Religion* contained the following mysterious paragraph: "M. Crétineau-Joly will publish to-morrow a book entitled '*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*.' What we have learned touching the opposition which the publication of this work has met with at Rome from several persons of eminence, imposes upon us the utmost reserve. We should be heartily sorry, for the sake both of the Church and of the author himself, if the perusal of it should confirm the apprehensions which have been manifested in such high quarters."

We confess to the infirmity of having felt our curiosity considerably whetted by these oracular lines; nor were we less intent upon getting a sight of the book, when in a subsequent number of the same popish organ we met with a letter from its private correspondent at Rome, which contains the following reflections on the subject.

"The work had been composed at Rome, where the author has spent the winter. Our glorious Pius IX., the most influential cardinals, the Jesuits, and the greater part of the historian's friends, had opposed this publication, and within less than a month after his departure, the book *Clément XIV. et les Jésuites* appeared at Paris. I know several persons who have already perused it; and the opinions are divided, not as to the literary merits of the work, but as to its tendency. All blame M. Crétineau-Joly, as you do, for having resisted a wish which ought to have been sacred in his eyes; but some, without perhaps looking very narrowly at the intentions of the author, condemn him for having divulged a secret of which the enemies of the Church may take advantage, while others, on the contrary, rejoice at this publicity. They say that this book settles the question; and that if Clement XIV. appears in it weak and ambitious, still he comes out of the ordeal without being chargeable with simony or injustice. They say that in several previous works on the same subject, the suspicions thrown out against his pontificate, the concealments in which he was enveloped, and, above all, the praises of the enemies of the apostolic see, placed him in a light not to be endured. M. Crétineau, they say, has shed

over this sad period of the Church's annals fresh and more vivid light. This light, in their opinion, is less distressing than the underhand charges to which the memory of Clement XIV. was exposed. This is the twofold impression produced here. It is not known, what the Holy Father, who had formally disapproved the publication of this work, thinks of the book itself; his judgment is impatiently expected. Whatever that may be, no doubt the author will submit to it."

It is not often that we agree with such authorities as the *Ami de la Religion*, and Pope Pius IX.; but on this occasion we fully concur in their opinion, that M. Crétineau-Joly has rendered a sorry service to the Church of Rome, by the publication of his last volume. The affair to which he has directed the attention of the world is, to say truth, a very ugly business; and the questions which it involves, are very awkward questions indeed. It must be any thing but gratifying to the believers in the infallibility of the Papal Church, to see the world supplied with infallible proofs, that the choice of the successor of St. Peter, which the uninitiated are taught to look upon as the result of direct inspiration from on high, may chance to be—in truth it generally is—a matter of vile intrigue and profligate venality; and that the solemn judgments pronounced from the chair of St. Peter, which lay claim to equal authority with the apostolic sentence, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," may be—in numberless instances they are—no more than the weak concessions of a temporizing diplomacy, preferring that which is "expedient," before that which is "lawful." If the sentence of the pope, solemnly pronounced "by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," and "in the plenitude of the apostolic power" committed to the successor of St. Peter, a sentence accepted, moreover, and acted upon throughout the "Catholic world,"—for none but "schismatic" powers ventured to uphold the order which Clement XIV. had condemned,—may after all be no more than a tissue of calumnies, and an act of the grossest injustice and oppression, which is M. Crétineau-Joly's Q. E. D., it becomes a hard matter, indeed, to ask any man to pin his faith to the authoritative decisions of "the Father of the Faithful," or the universal consent of "the Catholic Church." The nice distinction between "a brief" and "a bull," the latter being written on parchment, the former on paper, and therefore, as M. Crétineau-Joly informs us, "more easily revoked," is a great deal too nice to help out the unity and infallibility of the Church of Rome in so flagrant a case. Such extraordinary eccentricities in the "centre of unity," may perchance cause people to think, and raise questions to which even papal ingenuity may not be able to devise, nor papal authority to enforce, an answer.



But what, in the name of wonder, could tempt M. Crétineau-Joly, a "good Catholic" as he is, to write such a book, and to publish it in spite of the advice and entreaties of bishops, and cardinals, and of the pope himself? The evident object of his book is to justify, and not only to justify, but to glorify, the Jesuit order; and as instances are not wanting in former days, when the interests of that order were sought to be advanced at the expense of the "Catholic" Church, of her episcopate, and of the papacy itself, it is by no means an unprecedented supposition, that the unmeasured ambition of that society may, in the present instance also, have attempted to make a pedestal for itself of the papacy, in the person of Ganganelli and his cardinals, put into the pillory for the purpose of making the contrast between them and their innocent and glorious victim, the "Institute," all the more forcible. M. Crétineau-Joly, it is true, deprecates such a supposition, as grossly injurious to the sweet modesty and the self-sacrificing devotion of the holy fathers who have succeeded, not to the fortunes, but to the virtues, of the martyrs of Clement XIV.'s tyranny and injustice.

"The children of St. Ignatius of Loyola," he says, "had just causes of complaint against Ganganelli; but the duty imposed on them by their order, and the charity of the priesthood, were opposed to thoughts, inquiries, and revelations which, while satisfying their conscience as Jesuits, would have violated the dignity of the supreme priesthood; they therefore resigned themselves to silence. Those who, induced by the desire to record the virtues and the misfortunes of their brethren, related the circumstances of the suppression, never went beyond the limits which they had prescribed to themselves; they threw no new light upon the discussion.

"Indeed, we have proof positive, that if irrefragable documents attesting their innocence, had by chance fallen into their hands, the Jesuits would have annihilated them, or at least buried them in oblivion.

"From a feeling of pious delicacy, which mankind will never be able to comprehend, the disciples of St. Ignatius would have thought themselves obliged to do, what their adversaries would have been led to do from less praiseworthy motives. In order not to excite sad scandals, the former, holding abundant proofs for their justification in their hands, would have robbed posterity of these avenging documents; the latter, dreading lest they should find themselves at last constrained to do justice, would engulph them in the deepest depth of the abyss, because in Clement XIV. they love and honour, not a pope, but the enemy of the Society of Jesus."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 4, 5.

There is a favourite little expletive of the "impolite" Mr.

of kings and their ministers, written evidences, letters which would open the eyes of men born blind, came forth from chanceries, from archives and portfolios, where they had been buried for half a century. The conclave of 1769, from which the Franciscan Lorenzo Ganganelli came forth as pope, unfolded itself before my eyes with all the turns of its intrigue. Its glories were easily reckoned up; its shame remains to be told.

"The Cardinal de Bernis, the Marquis d'Aubeterre, French ambassador at Rome, the Duke de Choiseul, prime minister of Louis XV., Don Manuel de Roda, minister of mercy and justice in Spain, the Cardinal Orsini, Neapolitan ambassador to the Holy See, all these men wrote to each other daily, in order to keep up the double intrigue which they carried on both in and out of the conclave. Not one of these documents has miscarried; they are from the first to the last in my possession. There one may read, told from hour to hour, the temptations, the promises, the touting scenes among the cardinals, and at last the secret bargain which gave a head to the Church, aghast at these unheard of scandals.

"I had the key to the election of Ganganelli; I soon obtained the secret of his pontificate. The Cardinal Vincenzo Malvezzi, archbishop of Bologna, was the most active agent in the destruction of the Jesuits. He dictated to Clement XIV. what was to be done in order to arrive at this result. His letters, autographs like all the others, leave no room for doubt even in the most prejudiced mind. Around those great criminals group themselves those who could only lend them a helping hand in their work. Here we find the Cardinal Andrea Corsini; there Campomanès, the confidant of the Count of Aranda; and further on, Azpuru, Almada, the Chevalier d'Azara, Moniño, Count of Florida Blanca, Joachim d'Osma, confessor of Charles III. of Spain, Dufour, a French intriguer in Jansenist pay, and Nicola Pagliarini, the bookseller, who, after being sentenced to the galleys at Rome, was raised in Portugal to the rank of a diplomatist.

"By studying with the most scrupulous attention all the documents which these men addressed to each other, I have arrived at a knowledge of the facts. I had, and still have, under my eyes their original letters. They form the basis of this narrative; they constitute it. It is, properly speaking, only the softened expression of them; for more than once I was restrained by very shame from following up the effusions of buffoonery, hatred, impiety, or immorality, to which their intrigue gave birth."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 5—7.

Now, all this sounds very grand, and if the contents of the volume were answerable to what might be expected from such a command of materials, it would be very satisfactory. But, unfortunately, M. Crétineau-Joly gives his readers little opportunity of judging of the use he has made of these materials. He expects his readers to look up to him as to a great oracle, on the ground of his having seen and read all these letters; and

then he proceeds to tell his own tale as a violent partisan of the Jesuit order; and, strangely enough for one who, we should think, must have been distressed by the very superabundance of original matter which he had to lay before his readers in extract, he bolsters up his view of the case every now and then by reference to documents which have long been in print, and even to hacknied quotations, such as are to be found in the repertory of Messrs. Hoeninghaus and Audin, from "Protestant authors" who have spoken favourably of the Jesuits or unfavourably of their enemies. What need, we should like to know, had M. Crétineau-Joly to have recourse to the conjectures and opinions of Protestant writers, when he had the whole truth in the original letters of cardinals and ministers of state lying before him, as clear as the sun at noon-day; that is, if he was determined to tell that truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

But our disappointment does not end here. There is no essentially new light thrown upon the transactions to which M. Crétineau-Joly's book refers. Few men, ordinarily well informed on the subject, were, we fancy, simple enough to believe that Ganganelli was raised to the pontifical throne by any other means than the intrigues of the different courts, and especially those which were anxious for the suppression of the Jesuit order; still fewer simple enough to imagine that Ganganelli would have cashiered the order if he could have helped it. That he ascended the papal chair on the understanding that the order was to be suppressed; that he resolved upon the suppression with much hesitation, and under the influence of a strong diplomatic "pressure from without;" that in signing its death-warrant, his heart misgave him; and that he died miserably,—all this was pretty well understood before M. Crétineau-Joly's wonderful discovery of original manuscripts; nor does the *résumé* of the story he has built upon them, amount to much more than this. Nevertheless, his book is not without considerable interest: additional proofs are brought forward in attestation of facts either suspected, or established by previous evidence; and there are scattered up and down through its pages many "curiosities of popery," which will amply repay its perusal, and which constitute, we apprehend, the chief ground of objection on the part of the papal authorities against its publication. Into some of these we will now follow our author.

The first half of the volume is taken up with matters which have been abundantly treated of before; the proceedings, namely, taken against the Jesuits in Portugal, in France, and in Spain. Passing these over, we arrive in the third chapter at the proper

subject of M. Crétineau-Joly's work, the proceedings of the conclave assembled after the death of Clement XIII.; and here it is that the interest of his book begins. The most busy personage (not only always busy, but always prating,) in this conclave is the Cardinal de Bernis, to whose management the court of France had entrusted its interests. M. Crétineau-Joly places him in the front rank of the whole affair, which is, however, evidently not the position he actually occupied in the course of the transactions. It is, no doubt, to this factitious importance given to the cardinal by our author, that we are indebted for the singular and exceedingly worthless addition of a *fac-simile* of his passport at the head of the volume. What title this has to be considered as a curious historical document, we are at a loss to understand. The same remark, indeed, applies to more than one other document, of which a *fac-simile* is inserted. There are various documents from which a few detached lines only are given in extract, which in the interest of historical truth we should have liked to have seen *in extenso*, and of which a *fac-simile* would therefore have been both gratifying and valuable. For the most part, however, the documents selected for that purpose contain little or nothing of any importance; and can hardly be of any other use than that of duly impressing the reader with the execrable penmanship which, in the course of his investigations, M. Crétineau-Joly must have had to decipher.

But to return to Cardinal de Bernis. His eminence is the sorriest specimen of a churchman that could well be conceived. Needy and involved, extravagant and vain, he proceeded to the conclave, to which he was summoned for the exercise of the most responsible function of his high office, ostensibly in the service of the crown of France, but really for the purpose of serving his own interests, and satisfying his ambition, if possible,—his avarice at all events. That he had an eye, at the outset, to the post of secretary of state under the new pontiff, is pretty plain; and in this expectation he was encouraged by D'Aubeterre, the French ambassador, who, in a note bearing the characteristic date of the 1st of April, assures him that in all Rome nothing is talked of but the general estimation in which his eminence is held by the sacred college:—

“You have,” he says, “managed to inspire them both with love and fear. The public wish your eminence to be made secretary of state. I doubt if you are of this opinion. As for them, they are very right, and it is the first time that I have known them to wish for any thing rational.”—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 217, 218.

The bait took ; and one of the cardinal's subsequent letters to the ambassador contains what may be considered a tolerably broad hint on the subject :—

“ It must be confessed, that the court of Rome was never less competent for affairs of state, or more deficient in a knowledge of the courts. This ignorance is one of the greatest obstacles to the success of ulterior negotiations. These people have not the slightest notion what is to be done or avoided, in order not to commit the holy see in its relations with the powers. All their ideas of politics are confined within the precincts of Monte-Cavallo. Daily intrigue is their real occupation, and, unfortunately for the peace of the Church, their only science.”—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 220, 221.

The cardinal could hardly have used plainer language, unless he had said outright, “ Make me secretary of state ; and any job which the courts may wish to have done at the court of Rome, I'll manage for them.” But however potent the sense of his own importance, with which Cardinal de Bernis entered the conclave, and however great his contempt for the narrow views of the Italian politicians, the latter contrived to jockey him completely ; so much so, that when at last the election of Ganganelli was resolved upon by the party of the crowns, as it was called, poor De Bernis knew not what to make of it, and voted for the candidate of his party almost blindfold, under the orders of the French ambassador. His *amour-propre* was not a little wounded on the occasion, and D'Aubeterre had much ado to soothe him. But the most effectual anodyne, one of his own prescribing, was administered to him by the Duke de Choiseul. On his first starting for Rome, he had been supplied with a sum of 130,000 francs, in letters of credit upon Turin and Rome, furnished by the banker M. de Laborde. “ To prevent mistakes,” the cardinal had thus written from Lyons to the minister :—

“ M. de Laborde, in sending me letters of credit for Turin and Rome, tells me that as he does not know what will be the arrangements of the court for my journey, and does not wish to leave me in difficulty, he forwards me letters of credit. You do me the honour of sending me those same letters open, telling me that this is to ‘ provide for my wants.’ It is necessary that I should know whether it is the king who is kind enough to defray the ruinous expenses of a journey undertaken by his orders and for his service, or whether I am contracting a new obligation towards M. de Laborde. In the former case, I have to return my most humble thanks to his Majesty for having kindly supplied me with the means of accomplishing his views. The enclosed memorandum of my debts, which I beg you will submit to the king, will show him how much I stood in want of aid.”—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 240.

The cardinal stood, it seems, upon little ceremony; nor was he more squeamish in exacting payment for his services, such as they were, after the election. He obtained the post of ambassador to the holy see, with an allowance for "keeping house" at Rome; and in one of his letters to the Duke de Choiseul he says:—

"I have sent you the account of my old debts, amounting to 207,000 livres. I shall have to set apart a considerable sum from my income to liquidate them; this is a point of importance for my peace. Another point which concerns my happiness, is the restoration of my pension as minister of state. The king gives me that title; he sees that I have, in the eyes of all the world, had the greatest share in the election of the pope; would it consist with his kindness to suffer that idea to be impaired by any indication, however slight? I shall never be happy unless I obtain this favour. Let my nephew, whose time of service as a page is just out, have a company, and you will have loaded me with obligations, and attached me to you by ties of gratitude, as much as I am already attached by those of our old friendship."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 271.

The cardinal was "loaded" and "attached" to his heart's content; the Duke de Choiseul, who could not dispense with his services in the further pursuit of the negotiations at Rome on the subject of the Jesuits, agreed to his terms. After all, however, it was hard-earned money. The cardinal's position at Rome was undignified, and exposed his vanity to many bitter mortifications. In some of his letters he is himself facetious on the subject: "I am," he says, (p. 223,) "cobbler to the sacred college. I mend the cardinals' shoes when they don't fit." He is not, however, always in this happy vein; some of his letters betray great irritation and anger at the treatment which he received, and which was at times not the most courteous, as the following anecdote shows. Upon one occasion, when there had been considerable altercation in the conclave, De Bernis, annoyed by the tone of superiority assumed by some of the *Zelanti* party, said: "Equality ought to reign amongst us; we are all here by the same right." Whereupon the old Cardinal Alexander Albani, one of the heads of that party, lifting his red cardinal's cap, haughtily replied: "No, your eminence; we are not all here by the same right, for it was not a courtesan that placed this cap on *my* head."

The taunt was bitter; yet it was far from being the greatest degradation which De Bernis underwent. There is in the jocular familiarity with which Voltaire inflicts his blasphemies upon him, something so revolting, that we can hardly bring ourselves to transcribe his effusion; but it is too instructive as an illustration



of the alliance between infidelity and popery, in the high places of the Romish hierarchy, to be omitted. "Since, my lord,"—so writes the miscreant of Ferney to the miscreant who was sitting in the conclave, on pretence of waiting for the direction of the Holy Spirit in the choice of a visible head to govern the Church of Christ, but, in reality, to earn by intrigue the French king's hire, and to advance his own base and mercenary views :—

"Since you are still encased in your box, waiting for the Holy Ghost, it is very meet that I should endeavour to amuse your eminence . . ."

After this ribald introduction, the philosopher mentions a recently-published poem, from which he takes occasion to allude in terms of sneaking adulation to an insignificant poem which the cardinal himself had composed, and then continues :—

"A month ago, some strangers having come to visit me in my little cell, we set to playing at Pope with three dice. I played for Cardinal Stoppani, and made a raffle of it; but the Holy Ghost was not in my dice-box; one thing, however, is certain, that one of those for whom we played, will be pope. If it is you, I commend myself to your holiness."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 266, 267.

Shocking as is this piece of profaneness, it is indeed hard to say which of the two is to be esteemed the more offensive in the sight of God, the undisguised irreverence with which the patriarch of infidelity vents his buffooneries, or the vile hypocrisy with which these "princes of the Church," who in their conclave "played at Pope" after a more serious and guilty fashion, imposed upon the world the lie that they were, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, selecting him whom God had chosen to be the vicar of Christ upon earth.

The progress of the intrigues by which the election was for a length of time delayed, and at last decided in favour of a candidate "pledged" to the courts, formed the subject of a daily correspondence between De Bernis and the French ambassador at Rome, from which, as well as from the letters which passed between the cardinal and the Duke de Choiseul, M. Crétineau-Joly has given extracts, both copious and curious. De Bernis arrived at Rome towards the end of March, and on April 2 the ambassador thus addresses the cardinal, whom he designs for the "whipper-in" of the party of the crowns :—

"There will, it seems, be only forty-five of you cardinals in the conclave. Sixteen will suffice us for a vote of exclusion. When our forces are collected, we shall have ten whom we can entirely depend on: six Neapolitans, two Frenchmen, and two Spaniards. We must hope that we shall manage to secure some from among the cardinals of York,

Lante, the two Corsini, Ganganelli, Guglielmi, Malvezzi, Pallavicini, Pozzobonelli, and the two Colonna. The two last-named are in a situation to pay great deference to the court of Naples. Besides the personal property which they have in that kingdom, the greater part of their brother's fortune is there ; and by speaking to them, if need be, with a little firmness, I have no doubt they may be prevented from voting for a subject not agreeable to his Sicilian majesty."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 218.

In order to enable the agents of the three courts to act in concert, a list was made out, in which all the cardinals were divided into five categories, viz., good, indifferent, doubtful, bad, very bad. The last class comprised the Cardinals Torregiani, Castelli, Buonacorsi, Chigi, Boschi, and Rezzonico, men of ultramontane principles, who contended for the freedom of election. The "good" ones, *i. e.* those whose pliancy had been ascertained by the courts, were : Sersale, Calvachini, Negroni, Durini, Neri Corsini, Conti, Branciforte, Caracciolo, Andrea Corsini, Ganganelli, and Pirelli. These, with the two French and two Spanish cardinals, and Orsini, the ambassador of Naples, made up the sixteen required for an exclusive vote. They were not, however, all equally sure. Curiously enough, to Ganganelli's name there is, in the Spanish manuscript of the list, this note appended ; "There are letters which say he is a Jesuit." Neither was their co-operation expected as a matter of principle, without a "valuable consideration" of some sort ; still less were any of them considered sufficiently trustworthy to allow them to be put in nomination without a previous pledge for the suppression of the Jesuit order. To obtain this pledge, and to prevent any election until it was obtained, these were the two points to which all the negotiations tended ; nor were the representatives of the three courts at any great pains to veil this their purpose. As early as April 6, D'Aubeterre writes to Cardinal Bernis :—

"What one cannot do with all, your eminence might do privately, if there was a favourable opportunity, with the party proposed to be elected, before his election should be decided on, and make a condition of it. A cardinal, before he is made pope, is accommodating, with a view to his election ; and there are several examples of this kind of bargains. In such a case, the condition should be confined to the destruction of the Jesuits, reserving all other points ; and a written promise, or, in case of absolute refusal, an oral promise before witnesses should be obtained."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 219.

It is hardly to be supposed, that the nominee of Madame de Pompadour, the man of all work of the Duke de Choiseul, and the crony of Voltaire, could have any serious scruples of con-



science about this or any other proposal which might be made to him in his capacity as "cobbler to the conclave." But there was a certain punctilio of ecclesiastical etiquette about De Bernis, which made him often shrink from a measure nakedly proposed, to which he had no objection to lend himself, if it was brought forward with a due regard to appearances. So on the present occasion he demurred to D'Aubeterre's proposal. On April 11, the ambassador again alludes to it, endeavouring to remove his scruples, and to bring him round to his plan :—

" I am truly sorry that your eminence should object to the particular arrangement which I have proposed to you, which is desired by Spain, and would infallibly be desired by France, if the question had been mooted. The election of a new pope was the circumstance of all others the most favourable to our views that could have occurred. To make no arrangement with him beforehand, is to miss all, and to let slip the fairest opportunity, and the best and surest means, far surer than any means which might hereafter be employed by the courts. I am not acquainted with any other than natural theology, and shall never be able to understand why the secularization of a religious order, which no one can deny must foment division and trouble in the Church as long as it subsists, should be regarded as an illicit contract ; on the contrary, such a proceeding can only be viewed as meritorious, and tending to the advancement of religion. I am fully sensible that I am not competent to be the casuist of your eminence ; but if you would consent to confer confidentially on the subject with Cardinal Ganganelli, one of the most celebrated theologians of this country, who has never had the reputation of moral laxity, I am not without hope that he might incline towards my view. There is here no question of any temporality ; it is purely and absolutely a spiritual question. There is nothing more doubtful than what a pope, be he who he may, will do after his election, unless he has been bound beforehand."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 219, 220.

This proposal to consult Ganganelli, who was not put forward till some time after as the candidate of the crowns, is curious ; it shows that, whether knowingly or by accident, the ambassador was prompting De Bernis in the right direction. Whether the cardinal took Ganganelli's opinion or not, it is impossible to gather from the fragments of the correspondence, extracted by M. Crétineau-Joly ; apparently no such communication took place : and on the 14th, De Bernis writes to D'Aubeterre, still refusing to adopt a course which, he says, would be inconsistent with his ecclesiastical character, but assuring him, nevertheless, that he substantially agrees with him, and desires to see the object in view accomplished, provided it were done "by proper means." At the same time, he bitterly laments the difficulty of

finding a suitable subject, either for the papal chair or for the secretaryship of state. "He knows not," he says (p. 222), with admirable *naïveté*, "where to find for the latter office a man superior to their paltry local politics." Meanwhile, a scheme, previously suggested by a subordinate diplomatic agent, for the direct purchase of a sufficient number of votes to carry the election in the sense of the crowns, appears to have been revived, and the propriety of adopting it hinted to De Bernis by the ambassador. So, at least, we are left to conclude; for M. Crétineau-Joly suppresses in this place, as he does in many others, several documents which could not fail to be interesting, and which must have preceded the letter of De Bernis, who, with that indifference to the intrinsic character, and that punctiliousness about the outward propriety, of the measures proposed, which has been noticed before, thus remonstrates with the ambassador:—

"It must surely have occurred to you, that measures like these are only to be confided to one man, (of whom it must already be known that he feels no objection to them,) and not to five or six different ministers, and consequently to five or six secretaries, and to five cardinals, several of whom have been, or still are, friends of the parties whom it is intended to destroy. Where is the priest that would be so imprudent (even if he thought such means lawful) as to intrust his honour to the discretion of so many persons? This is (between ourselves) on this, as on some other points, the great fault of this conclave. It is impossible that so many consuls, on a footing of equality, should govern a republic all equally well. As far as I am concerned, I am glad of it; because there is no responsibility. But without a miracle matters cannot be carried on with any great success in this way."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 233, 234.

While De Bernis was thus playing fast and loose with the different points of the intrigue, desiring the end, but eschewing the means, ready to perpetrate the reality, provided he could avoid the appearance, of wickedness, other men of a bolder stamp, who understood that iniquity is not a thing to be dallied with, but must either be left undone or done outright, stepped forward, and by their successful interference soon put the fastidious French cardinal aside. These were the Spanish cardinals De Solis and De la Cerda. On the eve of their arrival, the Neapolitan ambassador, Cardinal Orsini, communicated to De Bernis the fact, that a more decisive plan of operations was about to be adopted. The French cardinal thus writes to D'Aubeterre on May 1:—

"Orsini has told us, that he was informed the Cardinal de Solis felt no scruple in requiring from the future pope a written promise to effect the destruction of the Jesuits. We shall wait till he speaks to

us on the subject; and we shall declare to him, that convinced as we are, no less than himself, of the necessity of extinguishing that order, we are of a different opinion as to the means to be employed; that we shall make no opposition to his requiring such a promise, if a case arises when it can be required, and that we shall most entirely co-operate with him in seeing it carried out whenever we shall see our way to do so without violating our rules. We cannot, however, disguise from them, that if the sacred college should chance to get knowledge of such a proposition having been made, we should infallibly be left in the lurch by the votes which constitute our power of exclusion, and which we have had so much difficulty in getting and keeping together; in which case we should have a pope, a secretary of state, and a datary imposed upon us against our will, and in accordance with the wishes of the fanatics."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 246, 247.

At last the Spanish cardinals, who appear to have purposely protracted their journey, in order that the conclave might be tired out, and the more ready to submit to their interference, arrived, and an interview took place without delay between them and De Bernis, who, on the 4th of May, still entrenching himself behind his former objections, gives the following account of it to D'Aubeterre:—

"We have disposed of the affair of the promise, and we have come to the following conclusions: 1. that we believe the destruction of the society of Jesus to be necessary; 2. that on this means of effecting it, neither we nor your excellency had any particular orders; 3. that we have besought the king not to give you any such orders, because we could not act upon them, contrary to the rules of the Church; 4. that we do not wish to control the opinion of any one, much less that of our brethren, who are on all accounts to be so highly respected; and that therefore, after having weighed every kind of inconvenience which we have pointed out, if the Spanish cardinals should persist in making use of that means, we should offer no opposition, but still less should we take any part in it."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 249.

De Solis and his colleague had not been many days in the conclave, before they satisfied themselves that the chief strength of the opposition were the two Cardinals Albani. They took their measures accordingly; and that with so much effect, that the fastidious De Bernis is unable, in a letter to D'Aubeterre of the 11th of May, to disguise his annoyance at their success.

"The Albani," he writes, "pay great court to the Spaniards. Their presents have an amazing effect. It is certain that we are not munificent; yet the least one can do, is to give sugar-plums occasionally to those whom one whips so frequently; but this is not the manner of France."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 259.

The whole aspect of affairs was now at once altered. By neutralizing the opposition of the Albani, the leaders of the *Zelanti* party, and formerly the patrons of Ganganelli, an election was rendered possible, and a way was opened for negotiation with that cardinal, who, as the suggestion to take his opinion, thrown out by D'Aubeterre at the beginning of his correspondence with De Bernis, leads one to suspect, had originally been thought of by the courts as the successor of Clement XIII. M. Crétineau-Joly, it is true, acquits the Albani of having sold themselves to the Spaniards; but in this acquittal we cannot concur. No doubt there is an awkwardness in differing from the opinion of one who has had all the documents under his eyes, while we can only consult as much of them as he has chosen to impart. Nevertheless, we think we have sufficient reason for coming to an opposite conclusion from that adopted by M. Crétineau-Joly. It must be remembered that M. Crétineau-Joly is, notwithstanding his high professions of historical justice and impartiality, a party-writer, labouring under a strong bias in favour of the Jesuit order; and that, while he has a direct interest in exposing without mercy the iniquities committed by cardinals and statesmen who formed the party of the courts, he has an interest no less direct in maintaining to the utmost possible extent the respectability of the Ultra-montane party, of which the Albani were so completely the head and the soul, that their venality is an infinitely more damning fact for the papacy itself, than all the intrigues of the agents of the three courts, lay and ecclesiastic, put together. We are therefore entitled, and bound, to look narrowly into the evidence on both sides of the question, before we adopt M. Crétineau-Joly's version; and this we are enabled to do with the greater chance of arriving at a correct conclusion, because M. Crétineau-Joly grounds his opinion avowedly on a passage in one of the letters of De Bernis which he has embodied in his narrative; and it is to be presumed, that if any other and clearer proof of the integrity of the Albani had appeared in the documents in his possession, he would not have failed to adduce it. As for the passage on which M. Crétineau-Joly grounds his acquittal of the Albani, it occurs in a note from Cardinal de Bernis of the 17th of May, and is to the following effect:—

“We thought, according to appearances, that the Spaniards had formed a great plan in securing the Albani, in which case the whole business might have been finished in twice twenty-four hours. But they have simply entered into an arrangement with Ganganelli, who has become cheerful and affable. He tells every body that he will not

allow himself to be proposed ; we shall propose him in spite of himself.”  
—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 266.

From this M. Crétineau-Joly draws the conclusion, that “without intending it, De Bernis removes the odious suspicions, which he had on the day before”—he might have added, on the morning of the very same day, and for a week past,—“vented respecting the alleged venality of the Albani.” No doubt, the passage quoted proves that at the time of writing it, Cardinal de Bernis believed, or affected to believe, that the Albani had not been bribed, as he had before asserted. In the absence of the entire documents, it is impossible to say whether this disbelief of De Bernis was real or pretended. It might be either, under the circumstances of the case. Cardinal de Bernis had, as we have seen, refused to enter headlong into the intrigues of the courts ; he had no objection, abstractedly, to the exacting of a pledge from the future pope, or to the proposed bribery of the cardinals ; but he wished to be more careful of appearances, than the impatience of the courts, and perhaps the necessity of the case, would admit of. The result was, that he was himself mistrusted ; and those who did not mistrust him, avoided him as a mar-plot. Accordingly, the Spanish cardinals kept their proceedings from him. Whether D'Aubeterre was privy to these proceedings does not clearly appear ; probably he was so, and in that case, he was a party to the concealment practised upon De Bernis, whose irritation he undertook to calm, and who was too dependent on France to refuse to vote, as he did at last, almost blindfold, for the candidate backed by the courts.

At this concealment, Cardinal de Bernis was, as his letters prove, greatly annoyed ; still more at the rapid success of the Spanish cardinals, who carried every thing before them in a fortnight, while he had been plotting in vain for more than a month before their arrival. He grew exceedingly irate, and expressed himself in no measured terms, as is evident from his letters to D'Aubeterre. Whether he did so elsewhere, does not appear ; but indiscretions were committed ; for a violent scene took place in the conclave itself, in which Rezzonico, the cardinal who among the *Zelanti* was next in importance to the Albani, complained loudly that corruption had been practised. This scene must have alarmed the court party ; it must also have alarmed the Albani, if they had entered into a guilty compromise ; and the personal bitterness which already existed between them and the French cardinal, and the contempt with which they viewed and had all along treated him, would greatly aggravate their alarm and indignation, if any suspicion arose that De Bernis was

the author of the indiscretions which had been committed. This suspicion the tone of his latest letters to the French ambassador was highly calculated to excite or to countenance; and the Spanish cardinals, therefore, or D'Aubeterre, or possibly both, would, without loss of time, either assure him that the corruption of the Albani did not exist, except in his imagination, if that was possible; or, if the case was too clear to deceive him, they would urge upon him the necessity of unsaying all that he had, under the excitement of his wounded vanity, ventured to say on the subject. In either case the poor cardinal himself would take the alarm; for to mar the plot of the courts, was to mar his own future fortunes. He would, therefore, be easily satisfied of the integrity of the Albani, if he could do so with any show of decency; or, if the facts were too evident to admit of this, he would be too happy to say and to write whatever might be necessary to counteract the effect of his former indiscretions. In this way alone can the singular fact be accounted for, that Cardinal de Bernis, who broadly insinuated the corruption of the Albani in his letter to D'Aubeterre of the 11th, and who affirmed it as a fact, supported by circumstantial evidence, and, it would seem, tacitly admitted by the Spanish cardinals, in another letter to the ambassador of the 16th, and again in another written on the morning of the 17th, did in the afternoon or evening of the same day, on the eve of the election, pen those lines which indirectly withdraw his former imputations against the Albani.

Having thus reduced the proof which M. Crétineau-Joly alleges in defence of these two leaders of the *Zelanti* party to its due value, we will now proceed to examine the evidence on which the charge of corruption against them rests. In the first place, there are the facts which led De Bernis to suspect their corruption. They paid their court to the Spaniards, according to the statement of De Bernis in his letter of the 11th of May: this was a fact not likely to have been invented by De Bernis, who had opportunities of personal observation, if it had not really existed. Early on the 16th he informs D'Aubeterre that Ganganelli is to be proposed; and he says, "I should not be surprised if the Albani were to vote for him." On the evening of the same day, after some explanations had taken place between De Bernis and the Spanish cardinals, he goes much further in his statements.

"They must have secured the Albani, whom I have seen for a long time in communication with them, by means of Ignatius d'Aguirra, the Conclavist of De Solis. Cardinal Orsini and myself had frequently



warned Solis of the correspondence of this man with the Albani. We feared he was betraying him; and proper dupes we were. This morning the Cardinal de Solis, to whom I expressed my astonishment touching the connexion between Ganganelli and the two Albani, told me that I must vote for him at the first scrutiny. I represented to him that he seemed to me a suspicious subject, on account of his connexions, and that I thought we should wait for him to make advances towards us, and assure ourselves of him, not giving him our votes except on good grounds. He took these reflections for a refusal. *Then the veil was lifted*, and I came to understand the nightly visits of his secretary to Ganganelli. *I saw that the Spanish pistoles were an excellent means for gaining the Albani, without whom any election is impossible.* I therefore, *after giving them slightly to understand that I saw it all*, declared to the Spaniards that we should second them in the way they wished, and that *all suspicions were dissipated the moment they had made sure of Ganganelli, and of those negotiators, the Albani.*"—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 263.

Here, again, there is the evidence of facts about which there could be no mistake. De Bernis notices that the confidential agent of De Solis is in active communication with the Albani; Orsini notices the same circumstance. They repeatedly warn De Solis, under the impression that his agent is betraying him. De Solis takes no notice of the warning. Further, De Bernis observes the intimate connexion between Ganganelli and the two Albani. He mentions it to De Solis as a reason for withholding his vote from Ganganelli; De Solis takes no notice of the objection, and insists on his voting for Ganganelli. Certain explanations ensue, necessitated by the obstinacy of De Bernis. He finds out what a fool he has been all along. He is now convinced that the communication of De Solis' agent with the Albani, and the connexion of the latter with Ganganelli, do not stand in the way of Ganganelli as the candidate of the crowns. He guesses, which it was not under these circumstances difficult to guess, that the insuperable difficulty which the Albani presented, has vanished before the gold of Spain. He gives De Solis to understand that he sees through it all, and De Solis never contradicts him.

Again, on the following morning, May 17th, De Bernis writes to D'Aubeterre, under great annoyance that the credit of managing the election for the three courts has been snatched from him:—

"In a general way it is certain that the Albani obtruded themselves upon me a hundred times. But as I had no money to offer them, and as you justly mistrust the fidelity of these people, I contented myself with living peaceably, and keeping on fair terms, with them. Hard

cash is better than any thing else. If Spain attaches the Albani to itself by good pensions, it will have the mastery of this country. We only know how to tear our enemies to pieces, and to cause them annoyance, instead of winning them over. But if M. Arpuru has not made sure of his bargain by heavy sums, and the expectation of others still heavier, I should not be astonished to see the Spaniards jockeyed; the more so as the Albani will never leave the Jesuits in the lurch, and will vote for Ganganeli only in the event of his having given the strongest assurances for the maintenance of the society."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 264, 265.

So much for the evidence to be derived from the letters of De Bernis; evidence which not only shows that (unless the Spaniards had been "jockeyed," which the event proved was not the case,) he was firmly convinced that the Albani had been bribed, but which supports this conviction of De Bernis by unquestionable facts, and facts which can lead to no other conclusion. But this is not all. To satisfy ourselves as to the real state of the case, as regards the Albani, we must look at the history of the conclave itself. For upwards of a month De Bernis and the ambassadors had in vain endeavoured to carry a favourable election. The obstacle to their success was the party of the *Zelanti*, with the two Albani, and Rezzonico, the nephew of the late pope, at their head. Without the consent of the Albani, no election was possible; with their concurrence the whole affair might be concluded, so writes De Bernis on the 17th, "within twice twenty-four hours."

This was the state of the parties before the arrival of the Spanish cardinals, and the influence which they are supposed to have exercised. And what was the state of the parties afterwards, subsequently to the secret negotiations between De Solis and the Albani, through the medium of Ignatius d'Aguirra? First of all there ensued on May 14, ten or eleven days after the arrival of the Spanish cardinals, and three days before the nomination of Ganganeli as the candidate of the courts was definitively resolved upon, a scene of great violence in the conclave. And who is, in that scene, the chief complainant? M. Crétineau-Joly thus tells the story, on the testimony of a letter written on the same day by De Bernis to D'Aubeterre:—

"The Cardinal Rezzonico declared publicly, that *the traffic in votes*, and the tyranny of the crowns, was an insult which the sacred college would not long endure. He said that, whatever might be the *bon plaisir* of the princes, *his conscience could never lend itself to their disgraceful traffic.*"—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 259.

This leaves no doubt how the matter really stood. The ground



of complaint was evidently of recent occurrence; the party which had cause to complain, was that of the *Zelanti*, which considered itself betrayed. The complaint was preferred, not by the Albani, the leaders of that party, but by Rezzonico, whose position had hitherto been subordinate to theirs, and who from this time forward appears as the leader of the party of the *Zelanti*. It is, therefore, as clear as the sun at noon-day, that the same facts which, as we have seen, aroused the suspicions of De Bernis and Orsini, and which the former learned afterwards to interpret correctly, had come to the knowledge of Rezzonico and the *Zelanti*, and that the complaints of Rezzonico in the conclave, against a disgraceful traffic in votes, was in fact directly levelled against the Albani, who had, as De Bernis suspected at the time, sold themselves to the courts, and had betrayed their own party.

Again: in the very same note of De Bernis, in which M. Crétineau-Joly finds the acquittal of the two Albani written, De Bernis, speaking of the proposed nomination of Ganganelli, says, that "the council of Rezzonico objected to this monk." Who are those here designated as "the council of Rezzonico?" None other than the *Zelanti*, hitherto always appearing as the party of the Albani. It has become the party, or "council," of Rezzonico, because the Albani have forsaken it. The Albani voted for Ganganelli: they could not, as M. Crétineau-Joly would have us suppose, vote for him through ignorance; for the *Zelanti*, as a body, objected to him, and therefore the Albani would have objected too, if they had not separated themselves from that party. It was this desertion which rendered an election possible. In case the Albani had been secured, says De Bernis in the same note, "the whole business might have been finished in twice twenty-four hours." But the whole business *was* finished in twice twenty-four hours. That note was written in the afternoon or evening of the 17th; and (p. 268) "On May 19, 1769, the cardinal chamberlain of the holy Roman Church announced to the city and the universe that Christendom had a new head. The conclave was terminated. Cardinal Ganganelli ascended the chair of St. Peter. He took the name of Clement XIV."

We have attached more importance to the elucidation of this point than, our readers may perhaps think, the character of the two cardinals in question deserves; for after all, it may be said, it can signify but little to posterity, whether their names are or are not to be included in the list of those whose votes were given from worldly and venal motives. The general charge of corruption against the conclave which raised Ganganelli to the papal throne, is but little affected by it one way or the other. This we

fully admit ; but on the part which the Albani played, and the motives by which they were actuated, turns another point of great importance to a correct appreciation of the transactions connected with the suppression of the Jesuit order, viz., the character of Ganganelli himself.

To vilify his character to the uttermost, has been, notwithstanding the fine and noble sentiments attributed to the Jesuits by our author, the constant endeavour of the Jesuits themselves and of their apologists, from the day of their suppression to this day. M. Crétineau-Joly himself, though his language generally keeps within the bounds of moderation and propriety, enters fully into the spirit of his predecessors. To represent Ganganelli as a weak but ambitious man, who secured his election by duplicity in the conclave, and by a disgraceful secret compact with the courts ; who, having ascended the chair of St. Peter by means of unlawful practices, was caught in his own snare, and constrained to cashier the Jesuit order, in direct opposition to his sense of justice and to the voice of his conscience, and who, for this abuse of the apostolic power committed to his hands, was visibly smitten of God,—this is, in fact, the main drift of the book. By what wonderful *escapade* M. Crétineau-Joly attempts to save the honour of the papacy, while he thus unscrupulously sacrifices that of its representative, will appear hereafter ; the present question is the degree of credit to be given to the imputations which he casts upon the character of the pontiff, who for a time ridded Christendom of a nuisance which had become so truly intolerable. We have no calling, nor inclination, to undertake the office of Ganganelli's apologist ; indeed, we are far from imagining that his conduct was blameless, either before or after his election : but it is due to historical justice to say, that the weakest portions of M. Crétineau-Joly's book are those in which he impeaches his character. Though we may not always be satisfied of the fairness with which the extracts are made, yet in the main his story is, on all other points, authenticated by public documents of unquestionable historical value ; but when he arrives at the character of Ganganelli, and at the conduct pursued by him both during the conclave and in the subsequent negotiations touching the suppression of the obnoxious Order, the arrangement of his narrative becomes extremely indistinct as to the sources from which his information is derived. Various anecdotes and *on dits*, such as are to be met with in other accounts of these transactions, are brought forward, and words put into the mouth of Ganganelli, between quotation marks, without any indication of the authority on which they rest. And after we have followed this kind of desultory tale, with which now and then a fragment of

documentary history is interwoven, for a length of time, we are suddenly surprised by the discovery that some of the foregoing particulars—it does not exactly appear which, or how many, of them—are “borrowed from the unpublished Commentaries on the Suppression of the Society, by Father Cordara,” whose manuscript history, or libel, as the case may be, preserved in the library of the Abbé Cancellieri, seems to be a great treasure in the eyes of M. Crétineau-Joly. We have thought it right to warn our readers of this flaw in the evidence on which our author’s representation of Ganganelli’s character and conduct rests; and having done so, we shall now proceed to notice the main points which arise in the course of his narrative.

On the first introduction of Ganganelli into the foreground of his story, M. Crétineau-Joly transcribes three portraitures of him, drawn from sources one more apocryphal than the other; the first from a manuscript notice of all the cardinals, drawn up by the French diplomatic agents at Rome, during the last years of the pontificate of Clement XIII.; another, from the secret correspondence of Dufour, a French agent, not improbably a contributor to the preceding document; and the third, from the manuscript of the Jesuit Cordara, already mentioned. These we pass by, and turn to the notices of Ganganelli which occur in the letters of Cardinal de Bernis, and which are not remarkable for their consistency. In a notice of all the cardinals, prepared by De Bernis for the French government,—the exact date is not given; *à peine entré au conclave*, is M. Crétineau-Joly’s expression,—he says of the future Clement XIV.:—

“He affects to feel great regard for the French, and seems to stand very well with the Spanish court. He has succeeded the celebrated Passionei in the office of reporter of the process of canonization of the venerable Palafox” [the great opponent of the Jesuits, who disclosed their missionary misdemeanours to Innocent X]. “Every body admired his courage in undertaking this charge in such times as the present. He does not seem to be a friend of the society of Jesus. In general, he is thought capable of the boldest measures for the accomplishment of his ends.”—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 254.

At no great distance, at all events, from the date of this document,—for De Bernis arrived at Rome at the end of March,—the same cardinal, in the letter of April 14, before quoted, three days after D’Aubeterre’s suggestion that De Bernis should consult Ganganelli, records the following opinion, materially differing from that before expressed:—

“If Ganganelli were not so much afraid of injuring himself, by appearing to be connected with the crowns, I should consider him a more

hopeful subject than any other; but that is all over; he spoils his chance by being over-politic; the more he conceals himself, the more is his ambition suspected. But he has been accustomed to this sort of conduct in his cloister, and he is frightened at his own shadow; 'tis a pity."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 222.

Within a week from this time, on April 20, he has again altered his opinion:—

"Ganganelli, with whom I have a quiet little flirtation (*une petite galanterie sourde*), has sent to assure me that his vote is at my disposal. Meanwhile he gives it to our enemies, in order the more effectually to deceive them. He does not like the mode of negotiation of my colleagues," [this is before the arrival of the Spaniards,] "but he pretends to have a high regard for me."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 228.

Again, after the lapse of another week, on April 28, Cardinal de Bernis has once more changed his mind:—

"The question is not, whether in the existing state of affairs an order which, if not guilty, is at least dangerous, ought to be suppressed; every dispassionate person must be of that opinion, and I am so very strongly: but the question is, whether, to attain that object, bishops may infringe the rules of the Church. However, this is not a point for us to discuss. We shall not be strong enough to get a pope elected agreeably to our choice. One must have faith, to feel sure that Cardinal Ganganelli is for us. He envelopes himself in mysteries which baffle one's reason."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 241.

These passages unquestionably prove that De Bernis was considerably mystified by Ganganelli, whose conduct towards him was any thing but frank. M. Crétineau-Joly presses the charge of duplicity against him much further:—

"Each fraction of the conclave," he says, "had heard him throw out some of those significant speeches, which admit a great latitude of interpretation. 'Their arms are very long,' he used to say, in speaking of the princes of the house of Bourbon, 'they reach over the Alps and the Pyrenees.' To those cardinals who would not sacrifice the Jesuits to chimerical accusations, he would repeatedly say with a tone of the greatest sincerity: 'To kill the society of Jesus is no more to be thought of, than to pull down the dome of St. Peter's.'"—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 256.

And, in another place, he ascribes to him another speech of a similar tendency:—

"'I shall never give my vote to Stoppani; for, if he were pope, I am sure that he would oppress the Jesuits.'"—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 261.

This, M. Crétineau-Joly would have us believe, threw dust into the eyes of the party of the *Zelanti*, and so procured the election of Ganganelli. But for none of these allegations does he produce any vouchers ; and from the documentary evidence in other parts of his account it appears, as we have already shown, that the point which carried the election of Ganganelli, was the secession of the Albani from their party, under the influence of Spanish gold. Besides, there is good reason to doubt that there were any members of the conclave sufficiently unsophisticated to be caught with aphoristical saws like those ; even De Bernis, of whom his brother cardinals plainly made a goose, was fox enough to have seen through such demonstrations. But whatever truth there might or might not be in M. Crétineau-Joly's anecdotes, it is clear that De Bernis knew not, to the last moment, what to make of Ganganelli. He writes to D'Aubeterre on the morning of May 16, before the scales had fallen from his eyes, respecting the negotiations of the Spaniards with the Albani :—

"Ganganelli is going to be proposed. I should not wonder if the Albani were in his favour. It is not easy to make out his real sentiments. I know that M. Azpuru and you, Mr. Ambassador, have a good opinion of him. He has not cared to give me the same impression ; and he is, of all the subjects that can be proposed, the very last whose horoscope I should, in case of his being elected, venture to cast."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 261.

And in the afternoon of that day :—

"It is evident that Ganganelli is a Jesuit, and that he has entered into a compact with them ; so the courts will be the dupes of this monk."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 262.

Again, a few hours later, when he seems to have had some hint given him by the Spanish cardinals, he says, evidently piqued :—

"These Spanish gentlemen do not tell us all. If they had spoken out, we should have cast no reflections on Ganganelli. We saw him supported by the Albani ; that seemed to us suspicious. It appears that an arrangement has been entered into with him ; and there is an end of the matter."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 262.

Still De Bernis seems but half satisfied ; for on the following day he writes to the Duke de Choiseul :—

"We must not conceal from the king that the cardinal (Ganganelli) has by his mysterious ways excited our suspicions, and that it is impossible not only to answer positively for his principles, but even to guess what his system of government might be ; so much are his proceedings

enveloped in darkness. His connection with Jean François Albani is certain."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 262.

Another sentence follows in the draft, which represents the Zelanti party as being in his favour; but this was erased by De Bernis himself, and therefore, so far from proving, rather disproves, M. Crétineau-Joly's position, and confirms our own view; the more so, as the passage respecting one of the Albani, immediately preceding, is not erased. A further confirmation is furnished by the *fac-simile* of a draft of a letter to the Duke de Choiseul, apparently the very same from which we have just quoted, the date being the same. It is there stated, that Rezzonico proposed Cardinal Colonna, and that this proposal was supported by the whole of the Jesuit party in the conclave; whereupon De Bernis goes on to deplore the hopeless state of the negotiation, as far as the wishes of the three courts are concerned, and then adds, "Perhaps the Spanish cardinals will be more fortunate in *their secret negotiations with the Albani and the Cardinal Ganganelli.*" Here, for some unaccountable reason, the *fac-simile* abruptly terminates in the middle of the page.

Up to this moment, therefore, De Bernis was still in the dark as to the real state of the affair, and anxious, it appears, to avert all blame from himself, in case the Spanish cardinals should prove to have been overreached by Ganganelli. It was not until D'Aubertre had re-assured him, that he began to see his way clear; and his reply deserves to be consigned to history, as a specimen of the principles on which Christendom was on this memorable occasion supplied with a "visible head and a centre of unity:"—

"I have received the note with which Your Excellency has honoured me; it is so reasonable and so plain, that it is Gospel to me. Consequently we shall at the scrutiny go full sail for Ganganelli."—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, p. 266.

We have seen by what means the election of Ganganelli was brought about. The courts had a party in the conclave sufficiently numerous to prevent, but not sufficiently numerous to carry, an election. After the arrival of the Spanish cardinals, who were better acquainted with the consciences, or less fastidious about the *étiquette*, of the conclave, than Cardinal de Bernis, the court party gained by bribery a few votes more; and he who was designated by the courts as the man of their choice, was declared by the conclave to be duly elected under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. To throw the chief burden of this iniquity upon Ganganelli, as if he had deceived the Albani and others who voted for him, as to his views and intentions, is manifestly unjust. No one seems to have been imposed upon; all the par-



ies were aware for whom they voted, and what reason they had for voting as they did. But what, it may be asked, was it that recommended Ganganelli to the courts, that they should make him the man of their choice? The answer lies in a nutshell. De Bernis had beaten about the bush for a long time with Ganganelli, and had gotten nothing by it. The Spaniards went straight to the point, and carried it with a high hand. They obtained, so says M. Crétineau-Joly, a note from Ganganelli, addressed to the king of Spain, in which he declares "that he acknowledges that the sovereign pontiff has the power to extinguish the society of Jesus in all good conscience, provided he bides by the canonical rules; *and that it is desirable the future pope should do all that lies in his power to accomplish the wishes of his crowns.*" M. de St. Priest, in his history of the fall of the Jesuits, has the same story, but without the last clause; and he, moreover, speaks of the note itself, as if he doubted such a document having ever been conceded by Ganganelli; the famous letter to the king of Spain, on which the compulsion exercised against him by that monarch was founded, being of a much later date, and, of course, subsequent to his election. But what M. de St. Priest does not venture to pronounce upon, M. Crétineau-Joly asserts point-blank, with the addition of the important clause marked in italics; yet he does not vouchsafe to inform us upon what authority or evidence his allegation rests. We have the greater reason to complain of this, as M. de St. Priest also had access to many, and, as it appears to us, to the most important, of the documents which M. de Crétineau-Joly has made use of; and it was therefore the more incumbent upon the latter, if he had really documentary evidence of a fact which hitherto rested only on hearsay evidence, distinctly to state wherein that evidence consists. Not that the point is one materially affecting the main question. Even though Ganganelli had given such a declaration in writing, it is too vague to be construed, according to strict law, into a simoniacal contract: and on the other hand, though not a line from Ganganelli's hand should ever have given a written clue to his intentions, there can be no reasonable doubt, that the Spaniards had, in some way or other, procured that pledge which D'Aubeterre pressed for from the first, and which Cardinal de Bernis was, or affected to be, too squeamish to demand.

From the history of the election of Clement XIV., M. Crétineau-Joly passes on to that of his pontificate, and especially of the negotiations which took place for the suppression of the Jesuit order. That history lies within a narrow compass. Ganganelli, pledged to suppress the order by his diplomatic constituents, bid by them what other men, more deeply and definitely pledged

than he was, often do by their constituents; he amused them with empty promises, and crammed them with vain expectations, in the hope that if he could not succeed in eluding his pledge altogether, he might at all events put off the evil day on which he should be compelled to redeem it. And for this Clement XIV. had many reasons, some good, and others bad. It would be doing him an injustice to say, that the desire of weighing thoroughly the merits of the case, was not one of them. For this he was, by his previous studies, particularly well qualified,—a fact of which M. Crétineau-Joly himself has furnished the proof; for, in his vanity and eagerness to display his extensive access to original papers and documents, he incidentally lets out that the private library of Lorenzo Ganganelli, the Franciscan monk, contained all the works which had appeared against the order. M. Crétineau-Joly seems to have made a wholesale purchase of them; for, he tells us, he possesses them all, with Ganganelli's autograph on the first page: "*Ex libris fratris Laurentii Ganganelli, sancti officii consultoris.*" This we consider a redeeming feature in the case; for this fact, coupled with his having undertaken the cause of the canonization of Palafox, the great opponent of the order, seems to indicate that the personal opinion of Ganganelli, long before his elevation to the papal chair, was adverse to the Jesuits, and that upon examination of the charges brought against them. Now if Ganganelli was actually in his conscience persuaded that the abolition of the order would be beneficial to the Church, and had in fact become necessary, in consequence of the many intrigues and quarrels in which the society had involved itself, the moral turpitude of the pledge by which, directly or indirectly, he procured his elevation, is greatly diminished; while, on the other hand, the tardiness with which he acted upon his opinion, when he not only had it in his power, but was pressed to do so, throws the most favourable light upon the fairness and impartiality of his character and conduct.

But besides the unwillingness to pronounce judgment in a cause of such magnitude, without mature deliberation, which was the ostensible, and in part, no doubt, was the real, reason of Ganganelli's delay, there were others which operated in his mind to produce that result. One of these was the protection which the order still enjoyed both in Austria and in other countries; one of the chief objects which Clement XIV. proposed to himself, being the restoration of a good understanding between the Roman see and the different courts. Another and a more powerful motive for protracting the proceedings as far as possible, was the personal fear with which the undisguised intimidation practised against him by the Jesuits had inspired him, and the



firm persuasion which he felt, and which the event abundantly justified, that in signing the sentence of dissolution, he was virtually signing his own death-warrant.

How deeply rooted this impression was, and how early it took possession of Ganganelli's mind, appears from a letter of Cardinal de Bernis to the Duke of Choiseul, written on the 30th of May, within less than a fortnight after the election, in which he says, (p. 272,) "His holiness is afraid of poison; he mistrusts all around him, and trusts no one." It is to the same cause, to the dread of a recoil, which the formidable character and the menacing attitude of the order were well calculated to produce, that the violence and suddenness of the measures taken at the decisive moment when the blow was to be struck, must be ascribed. M. Crétineau-Joly would have his readers believe, in the teeth of all history, that the Jesuits awaited their doom with lamblike resignation; and endeavours to extract from the communications of Cardinal Malvezzi, who was charged with the preliminary measures, a proof of collusion at least on the part of Clement XIV., with the vilest system of circumvention, for the purpose of oppressing and destroying the innocent. From these documents it undoubtedly does appear, that the course pursued by the papal commissioner, and by him suggested to the pope himself, was not the bold and straightforward course which a strong and upright government would adopt; and we quite agree with the author, that the crooked policy which marks the whole progress of the business is utterly inconsistent with the pretension which the Roman see puts forward, of exercising judgment in the earth in the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, "the righteous Judge." But it is one thing to admit, that the papal government was like all the other Italian governments, and perhaps more strongly than any of them imbued with Machiavelism, and that fear, nearly approaching to poltroonery, gave a character of more than ordinary cunning to the measures adopted by the papal government for the suppression of so powerful an enemy; and quite another thing to conclude from this fact, with M. Crétineau-Joly, that the Jesuits were innocent, and known to be so by Clement XIV. All the unworthy manœuvres to which he and his minister had recourse, are perfectly consistent not only with the guilt of the order, but with Ganganelli's sincere conviction of that guilt. Whether the order deserved to be abolished, or not, is a question wholly independent of the measures adopted in executing the sentence of abolition once resolved upon; it depends, according to the tenor of the brief containing the sentence, upon the previous conduct of the order throughout Christendom; the order was suppressed,

because it had proved itself, from its very foundation to that day, a disturber of the public peace of the Church. In order to ascertain whether the different counts of the indictment are proved or no, we must revolve the annals of the society from the beginning: nothing short of a complete and critical history of the society—for which we have not room at the close of an article, but which we hope ere long to see written, and perhaps to write,—can decide the question whether the allegations of the brief, on which the sentence of suppression is made to rest, are well founded, or whether they are so many gratuitous falsehoods, destitute and incapable of proof. M. Crétineau-Joly is, of course, of the latter opinion: we have, by a careful investigation of the character and conduct of the order from its first beginning, been led to a contrary conclusion; and therefore, however blameable, and to a certain extent even contemptible, we may think the conduct of Clement XIV. in allowing himself to be cajoled by the French, and dragooned by the Spanish government, into a measure which the dignity of the judicial office required should be an independent act, as well as in resorting to circumvention and tyranny in its execution, yet we cannot but say the measure itself was substantively an act of justice, loudly called for by the accumulated iniquity of the society.

In setting his hand to this act of justice, Pope Ganganelli exclaimed: "This suppression will cost me my life!" (*"Questa suppressione mi darà la morte!"*) and he was not deceived. Whether the death which overtook him within little more than a year after the suppression, and the wretched state by which it was preceded, was the natural result of the agitation and fear to which Ganganelli's mind was exposed, and of the means which he took to avert the fate to which he believed himself doomed, or whether it was the effect of poison, secretly administered by the Jesuits, is another question which our limits will not permit us fully to discuss. We shall confine ourselves to one or two observations on the subject.

M. Crétineau-Joly, aware of the terrible weight of external and presumptive evidence which fastens that suspicion upon the order, on whose integrity he has staked his own fair fame, endeavours to get rid of it by induction. Why, he asks, with an air of triumph, did the Jesuits not poison Clement XIV. before the suppression, when it would have essentially served their cause? And, further, he asks, what motive could they have to poison him after the suppression, when it was too late to arrest the blow?

As for the first of these questions, it is easily answered. The Jesuits were in a position too critical for them to venture upon

so desperate a measure as the assassination of the pope: however secretly the crime might be committed, its effect could not but awaken suspicion, and that suspicion was sure to light upon them, and to make their case worse than it was already. Besides, the Jesuits did not believe, that Clement XIV. would go the length of suppressing their order; his hesitation led them to hope that the storm might yet blow over; and under these circumstances nothing could have been more impolitic than so daring an act of aggression on their part. If it was ever thought of,—which an alleged prophecy of Bernadina Renzi touching the pope's death, as early as March, 1770, leads one to suspect,—the idea was afterwards given up: the prophetess, of whose intimate connexion with several members of the order there can be no question, and with whom even the general himself had at least one secret interview, changed her tone, declaring that the pope was about to be converted, and to become the patron of the order; that one of its principal members was about to be raised to the cardinalate; and that the order would be restored in those countries from which it had been banished. Undoubtedly this was by far the more politic course to pursue, while any hope remained that Ganganelli's mind might be wrought upon to adjourn *sine die* the proposed measure of suppression, which, truth to say, he was willing enough to do.

It is contrary, therefore, to the whole tenor of the circumstances, as they stood before the publication of the brief, to say that "the poisoning of Clement XIV. would then have been a crime advantageous to the Jesuits." But when M. Crétineau-Joly adds: "Then one might understand, however much one must disapprove it. But after the brief, what was the life or death of the pope to them?" we cannot but wonder at his assurance. Surely he is not unacquainted with the history of the prophetess of Valentano, the "*pythonesse chrétienne*," as he calls her; he cannot be ignorant of the attempts made, not only at the time, but quite recently again, and that among others by a certain M. Crétineau-Joly, both in his history of the Jesuits, and in the pages which he has transcribed out of that work, word for word, into his last book, to represent the death of Ganganelli as the judgment of God upon him for the suppression of the order. What hope remained for the Jesuits after their suppression, but their restoration? And what could more effectually promote that restoration, than the popular belief that their suppression was an unjust and sacrilegious act,—the light in which Jesuit writers have ever represented it,—for which Clement XIV. was punished by a most signal act of divine vengeance. And M.

Crétineau-Joly, who himself inculcates this notion with all his might, has the impudence to ask of what use the death of Ganganelli could have been to the Jesuits!

The truth is, that the strongest proof of the correctness of the suspicions which the extraordinary symptoms of Ganganelli's illness and death excited, and universally accredited, at the time, is that furnished by the Jesuits themselves. If one were disposed, in spite of all the evidence by which the charge of poisoning seems to be conclusively established, charitably to acquit them of such an enormity, they themselves render that acquittal impossible. For by their own statements on the subject they pin the world upon the horns of this dilemma: either Bernadina Renzi was a true prophetess, and Ganganelli a man smitten of God; or Bernadina Renzi was a tool in the hands of the Jesuits, and Ganganelli a murdered man. Being compelled to choose between these two suppositions, we have no hesitation in saying that we utterly repudiate the former, and consequently adopt the latter.

But what, all this while, becomes of the theory of the papacy? The infallible head of the Church, the vicar of Christ, the supreme ruler and judge of the earth, after years of inquiry, of deliberation, after many prayers and invocation of the Holy Ghost, as he himself solemnly avers, pronounces a sentence, founded upon a recital of historical facts extending over a period of two centuries and a half of the Church's history; and,—whatever individuals, forgetful of the respect due to the authority of the Holy see may say or write,—the whole of Catholic Christendom accepts the sentence, and acquiesces in its execution for the space of forty years. And this sentence, so pronounced and accepted, we are told, was an act of the most consummate iniquity, for which the seal of God's wrath was visibly set upon him who pronounced it; inasmuch as he died under the most horrible tortures of body and mind, and his corpse could not, on account of its loathsomeness, be admitted to the honours usually paid to the mortal remains of the Roman pontiffs. Nay, more than that, in the extreme agony of his remorse, by which his very reason was at last unhinged, he anticipated the eternal torments of hell, of which his sufferings in this world were the evident harbingers.

Such is the Jesuit tale, appended by M. Crétineau-Joly in all its apocryphal crudity, to a documentary history of Ganganelli's election and pontificate. And if that tale be true, what are the faithful to trust to? and what are poor benighted "heretics" to think of the "infallible" Church, and her "infallible" head?

Desperate cases require desperate remedies. So M. Crétineau-Joly seems to think; for thus he cuts asunder the Gordian knot of his own tangling:—

“ At last, on September 22, 1774, Clement's reason returned, but reason along with death. At that last moment, the full possession of his faculties was restored to him. Cardinal Malvezzi, the evil angel of the pontiff, was present at his last hour; God did not permit the successor of the Apostles to expire without being reconciled to Heaven. In order to snatch this pope's soul from hell, which, according to one of his own sayings, had become his habitation, and in order that the tomb might not close hopelessly upon him, who unceasingly exclaimed, ‘ O God! I am damned!’ a miracle was necessary. The miracle was wrought. St. Alfonso di Liguori was then bishop of Santa Agata dei Goti, in the kingdom of Naples. Providence, *watchful over the honour of the supreme pontificate*, even more than over the salvation of a Christian guilty of a grievous sin, appointed Alfonso di Liguori for its mediator between Heaven and Ganganelli. In the process of the canonization of that saint<sup>3</sup>, the manner in which this miracle took place, may be read:—

“ ‘ The venerable servant of God, while residing at Arienzo, a small town of his diocese, fell (on September 21, 1774) into a kind of trance. Sitting in his arm-chair, he remained for about two days in a sweet and profound sleep. One of his attendants wanted to awaken him. His vicar-general, Don Giovanni Nicola de Rubino, gave orders that he should be left undisturbed, but closely watched. Having at last awoke, and immediately rung the bell several times, his people hastened to him. Seeing them greatly astonished, he said to them: “ What is the matter?” “ What is the matter!” replied they; “ these two days you have neither spoken, nor eaten, nor made any sign.” “ You,” said the servant of God, “ thought me asleep; but nothing of the kind; you do not know that I have been to assist the pope, who is by this time dead.” Shortly after, the news came that Clement XIV. had died on September 22, at thirteen o'clock (between eight and nine in the morning), that is to say, at the precise hour when the servant of God had rung his bell.

“ Such,” resumes M. Crétineau-Joly, “ is the account, of which Rome, so fastidious (*sic!*) in questions of miracles, and so careful not to attest them without mature examination, accepts the responsibility in the acts of the canonization of Alfonso di Liguori. Rome has discussed it; Rome has pronounced; this *bilocation* is an historical (*sic!*) fact.”—*Clément XIV. et les Jésuites*, pp. 375—377.

<sup>3</sup> *Informatio, animadversiones et responsio supra virtutibus V. S. D. Alphonsi Mariae de Liguori*. Roma, 1806.—[The substance of this document has been published in English, by Dr. Wiseman, in a volume entitled: “ Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Francis de Girolamo, St. John Joseph of the Cross, St. Pacificus of San Severino, and St. Veronica Giuliani; whose canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, May 26, 1839:” at p. 40 of this volume, the above-mentioned story is related in nearly the same words.]

There is in this conceit of St. Alfonso di Liguori, the heaven-appointed "mediator," and Cardinal Malvezzi, "the pontiff's evil angel," both in close attendance on the death-bed of Ganganelli, a something which seems to tell us that it would be weak to despair of the revival of the good old "mysteries" in the nineteenth century. From what we have seen of M. Crétineau-Joly's qualifications as an historian, we make no doubt that he would be eminently successful in works of fiction; and we beg to suggest to him, whether it would not be as well to work up his *Clément XIV. et les Jésuites* in the shape of a *Melodrame Sacré* for the next season. The French drama is, we understand, just now miserably aground for lack of novelty; and even though the *Théâtre Français* should demur, we are sure the managers of the *Variétés*, if true to their colours, could not refuse to bring out such a piece, which, we promise him, would have "*un retentissement incroyable*."

Meanwhile it would be gratifying to our possibly morbid sense of logical consistency, if M. Crétineau-Joly would condescend to explain to us, how a writer who has composed a whole volume expressly to demonstrate that Rome may "pronounce," and be utterly unworthy of credit, as in the case of the brief of Clement XIV. for the suppression of the Jesuits, can have the face to claim belief for that wonderful "*bilocation*" of St. Alfonso di Liguori, on the selfsame ground that "Rome has pronounced."

With this question we take our leave of M. Crétineau-Joly and his book. As regards the merits or demerits of the Jesuit order, it leaves the question pretty much where it found it, barring the additional demonstration which it affords of the murder perpetrated by them upon the unhappy Clement XIV. As regards the papacy, we cannot but congratulate the world on this unimpeachable *exposé* of the "mystery of iniquity" at a moment when its "delusion" is so "strong" upon the minds not of the thoughtless multitude only, but of those who lay exclusive claim to the character of "thoughtful" Christians. We have no admiration, no latent tenderness, for any Erastian blemishes which may mar the beauty of our own Apostolic Church, but we think there is matter here to convince the most prejudiced, that to rush into the arms of Rome is not exactly the way to keep worldly power and the influence of Mammon from lording it over Christ's holy Church.



**ART. II.—***The Philosophy of Trade, or Outlines of a Theory of Profits and Prices, including an Examination of the Principles which determine the Relative Value of Corn, Labour, and Currency.* By PATRICK JAMES STIRLING. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1846.

A FULL and complete theory, embracing the economical condition of society in all its bearings and branches, is an achievement reserved for some future generation. The groundwork of such a comprehensive science may, indeed, be considered as having been laid. We are already in possession of many valuable treatises, written on detached portions of it. There is no lack of publications on wealth, population, corn laws, banking, currency, and other kindred and analogous subjects; but so far are we yet from being able to weave them together into one harmonious and consistent system, that the writers who have treated these separate parts are by no means agreed among themselves in their views upon the several points to which each has devoted his exclusive attention.

In regard to the main subject, especially, that to which all the others may be said to converge, and be subordinate, viz. *the distribution of wealth among the different ranks and orders of society*, if we compare together the works of the different authors who have treated this branch of the subject, the earlier with the more recent writers, we shall find that the latter, in lieu of following in the path chalked out by their predecessors, have adopted new and distinct views leading frequently to different and quite opposite conclusions: instead of advancing the science in the direction whither it was going, they have, as it were, changed its course by setting up a new and rival theory of their own.

This is a circumstance which offers matter for grave consideration. The contradictory of a received doctrine, if it can be established, is a retrogression in science; and if it cannot be established, must tend to retard the progress of truth; and it may be asked, how it happens, that while other sciences, free from such checks and interruptions, have from their earliest beginnings moved steadily onward step by step, economical science instead of advancing should have sometimes retrograded, or at most have remained stationary.

Of the fact itself, we think there can be no doubt. It must be admitted, that the contradictions and inconsistencies into which men of great talent and ability have fallen, have been more remarkable on this particular subject than almost on any other that could perhaps be named.

That inquiries of the kind should be attended with a result so different from what our experience on other subjects would lead us to expect, is, no doubt, very remarkable; and the reason of it we take to be this; that whereas in other departments of scientific inquiry, knowledge has been acquired by interrogating nature, and appealing to experience, in this particular one (partly perhaps owing to the abstract nature of the subject, and partly to other causes,) there has been a tendency to generalize too hastily, and to draw conclusions without a sufficiently wide basis of facts to rest them upon.

This will sufficiently account for the want of agreement among different writers, as well as for the inconsistencies observable in each; and it applies in a greater or less degree to nearly all the theories of political economy which have hitherto appeared, especially those which have been published since the days of Adam Smith, whose great work on the subject is more free from this blemish than perhaps that of any other writer.

We may, at any rate, venture to assert that the doctrines set forth in any or all of them will be found to approach nearer to the truth, or to recede further from it, in proportion as they are or are not founded upon facts and observations; and the volume before us, on which we propose to offer some strictures, affords an additional illustration of the truth of this remark.

The author introduces his subject with an inquiry into the circumstances which determine the proportions in which commodities respectively exchange for each other, or into what may be called their *relative* value; respecting which he lays down the following rule:—

“The value of one commodity in relation to another, or the quantity of one commodity for which a determinate portion of another will exchange, is less or greater according as the total supply of the one commodity is increased or diminished in proportion to the total supply of the other.”—p. 7.

This he illustrates in the following manner:—

“Let *gold* and *hops* be two commodities, and let one of them be employed to measure the rising or falling of the other. The value of a given quantity of hops estimated in gold, or the quantity of gold for which such given quantity of hops will exchange, will be less or greater according as the total supply of hops bears a greater or less



proportion to the total supply of gold; and the value of a given quantity of gold estimated in hops, or the quantity of hops for which such given quantity of gold will exchange, will be determined by the same proportion."—p. 7.

And again :—

"The value of money, or that commodity which is employed as a *common measure and equivalent*, as well as a medium of exchange, is determined by the proportion which the whole amount of money in circulation bears to the whole amount of the commodities to be exchanged. If the volume of the currency be enlarged without a corresponding increase of commodities, the money price of every commodity, or its value in relation to money, will rise. But if so, the same effect will be produced by diminishing the quantity of the commodity, without a corresponding reduction of the circulation. Again, if the volume of the currency be contracted without a corresponding diminution of the quantity of commodities, the price of every commodity, or its value in relation to money, will fall. But if so, the same consequence will follow from increasing the quantity of the commodity, the circulation remaining of the same absolute amount as before."—p. 11.

Now, against the doctrine which is here attempted to be established, we must beg to enter our protest. Far from agreeing with Mr. Stirling, that "it rests" on the basis "of facts which cannot be disputed," we think, we can show the facts to be otherwise.

It cannot be doubted that an increased supply of hops might be brought to market without any alteration of their relation to gold, although the quantity of gold should remain the same, owing to an increase of the demand for hops, co-extensive with the increased supply. There might likewise be a greater demand for hops, so as to raise their price, although the quantity of hops and of money might both be the same in the market. Nothing is more common than a temporary rise of price, occasioned by an increase of demand for a particular article; but as soon as the required additional supply is obtained, the price falls back to its former level, although the quantity, and consequently the supply in reference to gold or other things, may be *twofold* or *tenfold* what it was before. The same is true of gold or of money in any of its forms. An alteration in the mode of banking, or any other cause by which the use of money is economized, or the reverse, might make a less or greater quantity of it necessary in order to circulate the same quantity of commodities *at the existing prices*.

We cannot, then, it is clear, estimate the value of gold in hops, or of hops in gold, simply by comparing together the respective quantities of each in the market. Their value in relation to each other must depend on the demand and supply of the one, as compared with the demand and supply of the other. The comparison is a *complex*, and not a *simple* one.

Were it not that in a subsequent part of Mr. Stirling's work a reference is made to *demand*, and to the principle of demand and supply, we should have been tempted to suppose that the difficulty which he had felt of accurately defining that important word, (and which difficulty he alludes to in his seventh chapter,) had induced him to make the attempt of discarding it altogether, and of representing the supply of commodities as the sole determining principle of their value. It is, however, to be presumed that the omission was made in order to simplify the question. But the term cannot be so dispensed with; the want of it leads to conclusions which, instead of agreeing with the state of the facts, are at variance with them.

The reasonings, however, in the chapters which immediately follow, are fortunately not affected by this error, owing to the happy introduction of the term *price*. The price offered for a thing, is its value estimated in money; and as it represents the demand for it, so it carries with it all the force of that term. It would have been well if Mr. Stirling had introduced this word in the first instance: instead of saying that the relative value of commodities depended upon the respective supply of each, which we have shown *not* to be the case, he might have said that it depended upon the comparison of their respective prices, while the price of each depended upon the supply of it compared with the demand. To such a statement, no objection could have been made.

This reference, however, to price brings us to that part of Mr. Stirling's work which we look upon to be by far the best and most original portion of it.

He lays it down as a fundamental rule, that it is price which regulates consumption, and this doctrine is illustrated by him with great clearness and ability. The principle itself is not altogether a new one, but that prominence has not hitherto been given to it which it deserves. It has often been remarked that in the case of a deficient harvest the price of grain rises, so as to check the consumption, and bring it within the limits of the diminished supply; and that, on the other hand, in a very abundant harvest the price falls sufficiently low to enable the farmer to get rid of his whole crop, or so much of it as he chooses to bring to

market. But, in truth, the same principle applies, as Mr. Stirling clearly shows, to all commodities, at all times and seasons, and under all circumstances.

This is well explained in the following passage :—

“Suppose a manufacturer to be in possession of a secret for dyeing cloth of a particular colour. The cost of the dye stuff we may suppose to be trifling; but while the manufacturer keeps his secret, he has a strict monopoly, and consequently cannot be undersold by any competitor. There is nothing, therefore, to hinder his fixing his own price for his commodity. He accordingly names his price, and refuses to sell his cloth under that price.

“By this means the manufacturer will very soon discover how great or small a quantity of his commodity he can sell at this price in a given time. If the price fixed be high, he will probably sell but little; and although the rate of his profits may be exorbitant, he will soon find that his gains on the whole will be greater by reducing his price and enlarging his trade.

“Should he find that his returns go on increasing, he will go on reducing his price and extending his sales till his profits are only a little higher than the ordinary or average rate in other departments of production. At that point he would stop.

“By successive reductions of price, he has fairly tested the strength and security of the demand. He will therefore reduce his price no further, and the supply of his commodity will be no further enlarged. At every stage of this experimental process, the producer is enabled to discover with exactness what quantity of his commodity he must manufacture and bring to market in a given time, to be disposed of at the price and with the profit he wishes to obtain. He discovers what quantity is sufficient to meet the demand of those who are willing to pay the price he has fixed for his monopolized commodity. The same principle will be found to operate in other departments.”—p. 41.

Another important principle involved in the foregoing one, and which is likewise exceedingly well illustrated by Mr. Stirling, is, that demand is *limited*, or does not necessarily expand with the increase of supply. This, as he observes, is shown by the fact, that prices and profits, if above their average, may at any time be brought down by increasing the supply :—

“According to Adam Smith’s theory, if a manufacturer should sell his goods at a price more than sufficient to replace his capital with the ordinary profits, additional capital will be attracted to that department of production, and this additional capital, by increasing the supply, will bring down prices and profits to their average level. But this very fact proves *that demand is limited*. Did demand and supply expand together, and in the same proportion, no augmentation of supply depress prices. It is the alteration of the ratio between them

the proximate and efficient cause of the price being lowered; and if demand were to expand with every enlargement of the supply, the ratio would not be altered. But demand is limited; and it is the action of an increasing supply upon an unyielding or less yielding demand, which, on Adam Smith's principles, specifically causes the reduction of price."—p. 49.

This principle enables Mr. Stirling to give a much clearer explanation, than any we have yet met with, as to the causes or consequences of gluts:—

"It must never be forgotten, that while there are limits to the vent or demand for commodities, there are scarcely any limits to the productive powers of human skill and industry, aided by capital and machinery, in the various departments of manufactures.

"Hence, as regards manufactured products, the tendency of the market is always to become overstocked. Manufacturers, for a while, continue their usual rate of production; but sales get heavy, and commodities continue to accumulate, till the growing symptoms of a glut or stagnation of trade begin to appear. Those who have been trading on borrowed capital, are in the mean time called upon to fulfil their engagements, and there is a growing necessity for funds to meet the demands of creditors. Under this pressure prices give way; those who stand out for the natural price can effect no sales; trade almost stands still, and the ominous mutterings of a commercial storm begin to be heard; failures become rife; house after house is struck down; and, at length, there is a general crash. Bankrupt stocks are sold off at half price or any price, and this scene of ruin continues till the mercantile hurricane has fairly cleared the market of the mass of accumulated commodities.

"The reverse of all this takes place when the market is understocked; demand becomes more intense; manufacturers have orders for more work than they can get through in the time; producers and dealers raise their price somewhat above the natural price, the demand being sufficiently brisk to give them a ready vent for their commodities."—p. 55.

The foregoing views as to the limitations of demand, and the effect of quantity upon price, seem to be quite agreeable to facts and experience; by keeping close to which, Mr. Stirling has been enabled to throw a good deal of light upon what has hitherto been felt to be somewhat obscure. In the application, however, of his principles on this subject, he has made a singular exception in the case of corn, which he conceives to be a commodity *sui generis*, and to be governed by distinct laws of its own.

The consequences of this peculiar view we shall notice more fully, when we come to treat of profits; but, before entering upon that topic, we have some remarks to make on the intervening

chapters regarding the nature and value of labour. One of those chapters commences thus:—

“ Adam Smith has fallen into a great error in adopting labour as the sole measure of value ; and Mr. Ricardo, who has ably pointed out this error, has himself committed one as great, or greater, in representing labour as ‘the foundation of the exchangeable value of all things, excepting those which cannot be increased by human industry.’ ”—  
p. 71.

Now this criticism is well founded, or not, according to the interpretation which we may please to put upon the term *value*, to which a certain degree of ambiguity has hitherto attached, from its having been unfortunately used in a double sense. It is necessary to observe, that the proportion in which commodities exchange with each other, and which is frequently called their value, is *one thing* ; and the sacrifice which the purchaser makes, or must make, in order to acquire them, and which is also called (more properly we think) their value, is *another and a distinct thing*. Many writers have adopted the former sense of the word, or have used it in both ways indiscriminately ; but the latter is its popular sense, and that in which it has been mainly used by Adam Smith. The inquirer into the value of an article, with a view to its purchase, means to ask, *What is the cost or sacrifice which I must make in order to acquire it ?* and not, *What is the relation which it bears to other commodities that are in the market ?* Both meanings, however, have been included under the one term, which has led to the impression that they were identical, and occasioned much confusion and inconsistency.

That the difference between them is real and substantial, and not merely imaginary, the following simple consideration will serve to show. We all know that the production of commodities is greatly facilitated by the use of capital in various shapes, and especially by the substitution of machinery for human labour. Let it now be supposed, that in consequence of some such economical processes, twice or thrice the quantity of all things could be produced (money alone excepted), and that the demand adapted itself to this altered state of things, so that with the same amount of money twice or thrice the quantity of all other things could be procured ; it is obvious that this would not alter the relation of those things to each other, or their *relative value* ; nevertheless, the sacrifice necessary to obtain any given quantity of them would be but one-half, or one-third, of what it was before.

We may go further, and suppose the same facility to be extended to the production of money itself, with the like con-

formity of the demand for it to the increased supply. In that case, the *prices* of commodities would continue the same as they originally were; but as the labourer would obtain twice or thrice the quantity of those commodities, so would he likewise earn twice or thrice his former money wages. This rise of wages would be a fall in the value of money; for the sacrifice necessary to procure any given quantity of it would be one-half or two-thirds less than it was before.

This, then, was the light in which Adam Smith and Mr. Ricardo viewed value. They applied it as a *measure of cost*. They held (and we think rightly) that a given quantity of labour (that is, of labour of a given kind and duration) always represented an *uniform degree or amount of sacrifice*, which cannot be said of any of its products. It is certain that a given quantity of those products does not always represent the same sacrifice. If it did, quantity and value would always agree together, and be synonymous or convertible terms. It is because they do not always agree, that we are in need of some criterion by which to measure their variations. We cannot do this without some standard to refer to; and for the reasons above assigned, labour seems to be the very one required. So far both these great writers were agreed, though they differed in this, that whereas the latter measured the value of every thing by the labour which it cost the *producer*, the former (we think more correctly) estimated the value of a commodity by the labour which it cost the *purchaser*, or, what comes to the same thing, by the quantity of labour which it would command in the market.

After noticing that labour, like other things, may be bought and sold, Mr. Stirling adds in a note:—

“ ‘This view of the subject happily puts an end to the controversy about productive and unproductive labour, a dispute rather about *words* than *things*. To make a musical instrument is productive, to play upon it is unproductive labour. The man who builds a church is a productive, the clergyman who uses that church for the celebration of divine service an unproductive labourer. The physician who heals, labours unproductively; the butcher who kills labours productively. These are specimens. Now all such unmeaning distinctions are swept away, and this unprofitable controversy settled at once, by regarding labour simply as a thing which is bought, sold, and exchanged.’—  
p. 68.

Adam Smith having confined the term *wealth* to *material* things, drew a distinction between the labour which is immediately employed in the production of such things, and that which was not so employed; the former he called *productive*, and the



latter *unproductive* labour. Whether those terms were the best he could have chosen for the purpose may be disputed; at any rate, it is a matter of opinion; but the distinction itself is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact. It cannot be denied, that there are some labourers who are employed in the immediate production of wealth, and that there are other labourers whose time is spent in other vocations. That both these kinds of labour are the subject of purchase and sale is likewise true. But the two facts are perfectly distinct from each other; and how Mr. Stirling could imagine that the one invalidated the other, we are utterly at a loss to conceive.

We now pass on to the third section of the work, which professes to treat of profits. It appears to us to contain much that is sound and excellent, especially in that part of it which relates to money and coinage—subjects somewhat extraneous, indeed, to that under which they are classed.

On the main topic itself, the author has originated some very peculiar doctrines, which we cannot consider as resting on any solid foundation. He states very correctly, that the ordinary or average rate of profit is maintained by the transfer of capital from one employment to another; but he is impressed with the notion that there could be no such average rate, unless there existed in some special department of industry a *natural* rate of profits, by which he means one that is “self-regulated and incapable of being arbitrarily elevated or depressed” (p. 159); and such a natural rate of profits he conceives that he has discovered “in that department of production from which the food of the great body of the people is derived.”—p. 173.

This is evidently a corollary from the doctrine to which we have already had occasion to refer, namely, that the market can never be permanently over-supplied or under-supplied with food, because (so thinks Mr. Stirling) the numbers to be fed will always conform themselves to the quantity of subsistence to be obtained, whether it be great or small.

His views on this subject are expressed as follows:—

“Corn (by which we must be understood to mean whatever constitutes the ordinary food of the great body of the people) must be regarded as a commodity *sui generis*. Its price is governed partly by the same laws which regulate the price of other commodities, and partly by laws of its own, which require a separate consideration.

“Taking periods long enough to allow of the full action of the principle of population, corn has this peculiarity, that it creates a market for itself, *i. e.* the supply of corn, like the supply of other commodities, accommodates itself to the demand; or if it do not, the demand, unlike what takes place with reference to any other commodity, accommodates



itself to the supply ; both are flexible. No continued overstocking of the market can permanently lower its value ; for the demand expands with the expansion of the supply. No continued understocking of the market can permanently elevate its value ; for with the contraction of the supply there is a corresponding contraction of demand."—p. 59.

The doctrine set forth in these extracts seems to us to involve much fallacy and misconception.

In the first place, if more capital be at any time applied to the land than is required in order to meet the increasing demand for its produce (whether occasioned by the increase of population or by any other cause), the profits of such capital would fall just as much as they would in any other employment. The very principle referred to by Mr. Stirling, and which he seems here to have lost sight of, would thereby be called into operation, so as to occasion this effect :—

" Within short periods, during which demand may be said to be a given quantity, or at least as less flexible than supply, the price of corn, like the price of every thing else, depends upon the proportion between the supply and the demand ; its value is regulated by its relative quantity."—p. 61.

Secondly : the labourer's command over subsistence does not depend upon the comparative supplies of food and of labour in the market, but, as we have before endeavoured to show, on the demand and supply of the one as compared with that of the other. The people, indeed, must be fed, but they may be *well* fed, or they may be *ill* fed. The labourer's wages may be such as to enable him to command more food at one time than at another, not because *it* is more plentiful or scarce, but because he has more or less employment, and consequently earns a larger or smaller amount of wages.

This greater or less quantity of employment, both as it affects the condition of the labouring classes (who constitute the mass of the people), and the demand for food and the other necessities of life, is a consideration of the utmost importance, which has been entirely overlooked, not only by Mr. Stirling, but likewise by many other writers.

The present state of Europe in general, and of our own country in particular, affords a remarkable illustration of the operation and effects of this principle. An unusually large body of labourers is every where employed in the construction of railways. As fast as fresh capital is accumulated, it is converted into wages for their maintenance. Being fully employed, they earn high wages, or, we should rather say, a large amount of wages ; their earnings being large, not so much because the rate at which they are paid

s high in proportion to the work done by them, as because their employment is *incessant*. The result of this is a great and increasing demand for food and the other necessities of life, which tends to keep up the prices of those commodities, and make it profitable to the producers to increase the supply of them.

Now let us imagine this state of things to be reversed. Let us suppose, that owing to some apprehension of their becoming ultimately unprofitable, or to any other cause, no matter what, these stupendous works were suspended or abandoned; it is evident that such discontinuance would be attended with the effect of throwing out of employ a considerable mass of individuals; and as other employments could not be very readily found for them, their competition would lower their wages, and oblige them to reduce their demand for food and other necessities. The supply, indeed, of food and of labour in the market would at first be the same; but the demand for them would *not* be the same. The labourers would not have the means of purchasing the same quantity of food as before, and the sellers would find themselves without a market for a portion of their produce. The former, instead of being, as they were, well fed and well clothed, would now be ill fed and ill clothed; and the latter would have to sell their commodities at greatly reduced prices, perhaps even at a loss.

Such a state of things, although not arising from the cause here alluded to, (and which is here introduced merely for the purpose of illustration,) has been exemplified over and over again in our own country. We have seen alternately recurring periods of full employment, and of little or insufficient employment, for the labouring classes (with longer or shorter intervals between them), during which the general demand has been either brisk or slack accordingly.

All this shows the great importance of demand, and the impossibility of giving any satisfactory explanation of the laws which regulate the distribution of wealth, without a constant reference to it. And we cannot therefore but think, that to attempt arriving at the value of different things, merely by putting the respective supplies of each into juxta-position with each other, and to found conclusions upon such comparison, without taking into account the causes which increase or diminish the demand for each independently of the rest, (which is what Mr. Stirling has done,) is to erect a theory which has not experience for its basis, and which must therefore lead to erroneous conclusions.

On the subject of rent, Mr. Stirling has adopted Mr. Ricardo's theory, in considering it as originating in the necessity of resorting to soils of continually decreasing fertility, in order to

meet the wants of an increasing population, or, what is in result the same thing, to the decreasing returns from successive portions of capital applied to the same land.

That rent is a surplus which remains after defraying all the costs of cultivation, and that the most fertile soils, as yielding the largest amount of surplus, will consequently yield the highest rent, is sufficiently obvious. But gradations of fertility, or unequal returns to additional capital applied to the land, are certainly not *theoretically* necessary to the existence of rent, however true the fact of such inequality may be. The owners of the land are the proprietors of certain productive machines, which they let at a rent proportioned to their respective productive powers; and if all lands were equally fertile, there seems to be no reason why they should not all yield an uniform rent.

What is necessary to the existence of rent, is, first, the *absolute*, and not merely the *relative* fertility of the soil, i.e. that it shall actually yield more food than is sufficient for the maintenance of those employed in its cultivation.

Secondly, that it shall be limited in its extent, compared with the population which it is to support.

It is evident, that if the cultivators could only raise sufficient food for their own maintenance, there could exist no fund for the payment of rent. "If," says Mr. Malthus, "the earth had been so niggardly of her produce as to oblige all her inhabitants to labour for it, no manufactures or idle persons could ever have existed. But her first intercourse with man was a voluntary present, not very large indeed, but sufficient as a fund for his subsistence till he could procure a greater. And the power to procure a greater was given to him in that quality of the earth by which it may be made to yield a much larger quantity of food, and of the materials of clothing and lodging, than is necessary to feed, clothe, and lodge the persons employed in the cultivation of the soil. This quality is the foundation of that surplus produce which peculiarly distinguishes the industry employed on the land<sup>1</sup>."

The fertility of the soil then combined with the natural limitation of its quantity, enables those who have the monopoly of it, that is, the owners, to exact a payment for the use of it.

In regard to Mr. Ricardo's hypothesis, that the best lands are the first occupied, and then the next best, and the rest in succession, which, for the purpose of illustrating his argument, he has very ingeniously represented by the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, &c., it would probably be difficult, in most cases, to ascertain beforehand (that

<sup>1</sup> Essay on Population, book iii. chap. 8.

is, prior to their being taken into cultivation) which were numbers 1, 2, 3, or 4; and as each portion of land can absorb but a limited amount of capital, the distinction of such capital into more or less productive portions seems to be quite fanciful.

To represent, therefore, rent as occasioned solely by different degrees of fertility, which is what Mr. Ricardo has done, is to mistake the *measure* of rent for its *cause*.

This view of it is nevertheless taken by Mr. Stirling; the only difference being, that whereas Mr. Ricardo supposes the price of corn to rise in the progress of society, and the gradual fall of manufacturing profits to be occasioned by the continued rise of the money price of labour; Mr. Stirling assumes corn and labour to remain at the same average price, or nearly so, and attributes the fall of agricultural profits to the increasing payment of rent, and the fall of manufacturing profits to the gradual decline of prices.

It is obvious, that this difference is merely a question as to the value of money, which, in the one case, is assumed to be constant, and in the other, to be variable, in reference to labour. But this circumstance, although a very important one as it regards those classes who live upon fixed money incomes, does not affect the question at issue. On either supposition, there would be a change in the relative value of corn and other commodities. Corn would rise relatively to them, and they would fall relatively to it.

Upon this basis, however, it is, that Mr. Stirling builds the rest of his system regarding profits.

He says :

“We now proceed to inquire how the rate of profits is affected by the descent to inferior soils; and here it is necessary to revert to the consideration that it is the pressure of population on the means of subsistence, which causes successive additions to be made to the food of a country. The multiplication of numbers goes on till the best land (No. 1) is fully cultivated; but it does not stop there: it tries to go beyond that point. But there being no more corn, and a greater population to feed, each labourer must receive less corn than he did before. At the same time, there being no addition to the amount of the circulation, money wages must fall. But this temporary reduction of the price of labour causes a temporary elevation of the farmers' profits, in consequence of which he will be content to cultivate land which yields him a proportionally smaller return. Land (No. 2) is accordingly now cultivated, and the required addition to the supply of corn is produced and brought to market. But the moment the demand of the additional population is met and satisfied, corn wages return to

their former rate. Labour is cheaper, but corn is also cheaper; and the money price of both having fallen, the labourer has re-acquired his former command over food. The money price of both the product and the outgoings of the cultivator has been equalized, for both have fallen in an equal degree; and the difference between the cost and the product, whatever it be, is the *new* rate of profits."

Now the whole of this is founded upon the two assumptions which we have before alluded to, viz. first, the attempt to estimate the value of things by the mere comparison of the quantities of each in the market, irrespective of the demand for them; and, secondly, the belief that the land is taken into cultivation in a regularly descending series of fertility.

But, as we have before shown, the price of food, and consequently the encouragement to increase its quantity, is not determined solely by the supply of food on the one hand, and the supply of labour on the other, but depends in a great degree upon the greater or less quantity of employment, which calls into action more or less labour, independently of the actual number of the labourers employed. Neither is it the cultivation of a particular quality of soil which determines what the *natural* rate of profits shall be. *That* rate consists of the average of all the separate rates; it is determined by the average demand compared with the average supply of the whole mass of commodities that are brought to market; and the lands that are capable of yielding that average will be taken into tillage, while those that are not, will be neglected or thrown out of cultivation.

This is the old doctrine of Adam Smith upon this subject, and the history of all civilized countries and communities tends to confirm and establish it; while the new doctrines of Mr. Ricardo and Mr. Stirling, being founded upon purely hypothetical and visionary data, have no foundation in experience, and do not represent things as they are passing in real life.

We are sorry to differ from Mr. Stirling on these important points; but having stated the grounds of our disagreement, we feel no reluctance in laying them before the reader, our sole object being, as we are sure Mr. Stirling's is also, the dissemination of sound views on the subject.

Before, however, we take leave of his work, it gives us pleasure to be able to express our concurrence with the principles that are laid down in the fifth and concluding book. This part of his performance Mr. Stirling has devoted to the consideration of foreign trade, and the reader will find therein the subject of the exchanges and that of the currency (so far as he has gone into it) ably and clearly stated and explained.

In conclusion, we would observe in reference to the statement with which we began, that Mr. Stirling's work affords samples of the faults and excellences of most others on subjects of economical science. Some of his reasonings are founded on mere abstractions, or a supposititious state of things, while others are grounded upon facts to which experience can testify. We can give but little praise to the former; but we can recommend the latter, as being, in our judgment, not only excellent of their kind, but in many respects the best that we have any where met with.

- ART. III.—1. *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis: Ecclesie Cathedralis Aberdonensis regesta que extant, in unum collecta.* 2 vols. 4to. Edinburgh, 1845.
2. *Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen, 1398—1570.* Aberdeen, 1844.
3. *Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.* Aberdeen, 1846.
4. *Extracts from the Presbytery Book of Strathbogie, 1631—1654.* Aberdeen, 1843.

(Continued from No. XIV. Art. VI.)

WE resume our survey of these volumes, which was interrupted by the pressure of matter more immediately urgent at the time of our last publication.

From the subject of forbidden holydays, we pass to that of the Lord's-day. In the earlier times, there are occasional orders for observing it by abstaining from trade; as in 1449, it was enacted that any person opening his booth on the Sunday should pay a pound of wax to the kirk-work<sup>1</sup>: but after the Reformation there is a much more frequent notice of the day, and a greatly altered view as to the duty involved in a right observation of it. The orders of 1562 cannot, indeed, be regarded as at all extravagant in this respect<sup>2</sup>; nor can we find ground for any thing but praise in the attempts to put down all Sunday trading—one of which was undertaken at the expense of a lawsuit in the courts of Edinburgh, for the purpose of abolishing a market<sup>3</sup>.

But, not content with reforming such abuses as are contrary to our feelings of the holiness of the day, the kirk session soon proceeded to more rigid measures. And, although tourists who look only at the surface, are greatly impressed by the stillness and solemnity which now mark the Lord's-day in Scotland; it is, we believe, established on the most unquestionable evidence of persons who really know the working of the system, that the extreme rigour of the presbyterian Sabbath—the “bitter observance,” as some one styled it by a slight change in the title of Sir Andrew Agnew's bill—has, in truth, a very pernicious effect on the morals and religion of the people<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Burgh Reg. 402.

<sup>2</sup> Eccl. Rec. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Burgh Reg. 357.

<sup>4</sup> One striking phenomenon of the Scotch town Sunday—the crowds of people which are seen in the streets immediately before and after service—really arises in great part from a cause the very opposite of healthy; viz. that the parochial tie is altogether unrecognized in the towns of Scotland. Every one chooses his own preacher; and thus the thronged appearance of the streets is not so much because people go to places of worship, as because they go away from those which have the parochial claim on them.



It is certainly desirable that people should go to church, and should not idle about during the time of Divine service ; but it is very doubtful whether a system of *compulsion* to the better course would, on the whole, be salutary ; nor does it appear that any reformation was effected by the inquisitorial prying into the unostentatious, though blameable, occupations of Sabbath-breakers which are so frequently mentioned in the volumes before us.

Take as an example of the regulations on this subject, the following, of date 1603 :—

“ It is thought expedient that ane ballie, with twa of the session, pass through the town every Sabbath-day, and note such as they find absent from the sermons, either afore or after noon ; and for that effect, that they pass and search such houses as they think maist meet ; and chiefly that now, during the summer season, they attend, or cause ane attend, at the ferry-boat, and note the names of sic as gangs to Downie, that they may be punished. Also, the session appoints order to be taken with the absents fra the sermons on the week-day, and their names noted and given up to the session ‘.”

The watching of the ferry is frequently noticed, and fines for crossing are inflicted. The compulsory attendance at week-day sermons is also often mentioned ; honest Spalding groaned sorely under it.

But who shall keep the keepers ? While the familiars of the session and council were charged with the task of observing and delating Sabbath-breakers, the following is the account of their own behaviour in 1606 :—

“ It was delated to the session that the ordinar officers and servants of this burgh keep not the sermons, but drinks both sabbath-day and week-day in time of sermon, to the great slander of the Gospel ‘.”

And it was found necessary, in consequence, to put them under very stringent regulations.

The kirk session found it less safe to meddle with the gainful occupation of salmon-fishing on Sunday, than with the amusements on which it kept so vigilant an eye. When the fishing on Sunday was attacked, in 1606, many of the weighty burghers concerned in the trade agreed to abandon the practice ; but some were found unwilling, or even contumacious. Thomas Forbes “ promised only to abstain in his own person, but would not promise for his servants :” Alexander Rolland “ promised to abstain for that present year only, until he were further advised ;” and doubtless he employed the interval in consulting the most eminent casuists of the day ; while Mr. Thomas Menzies (a Romanist, or

<sup>5</sup> Eccl. Rec. 26.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 55.

person of Romish connexions,) avowed an intention of persisting in the old custom, until it should be forbidden by a general law<sup>1</sup>.

Two years later, the session, taking into consideration the causes of a late earthquake and an approaching pestilence, resolved that salmon-fishing on the Sabbath was the chief provocation of these judgments, and the parties concerned in the fishing were required to abstain. Some, however, were still obdurate. Walter Menzies declared himself not yet resolved; James Seaton and David Ferguson would not forbear, unless all others did the like. Thomas Menzies and two others absolutely refused<sup>2</sup>. We do not know that the subject recurs until 1657, when the synod directed the presbytery to restrain the fishing more completely, and to call in the assistance of the justices of peace for that purpose<sup>3</sup>.

Among other breaches of the Sabbath, we find the cutting and carrying of corn repeatedly denounced; all travelling of every kind; playing at football; bleaching of cloth; hanging out a web to dry; sleeping in time of sermon, (not in the kirk,—although, that, too, was liable to punishment,—but) “on the loch-side;” carrying a caldron through the streets; brewing of aqua-vitæ, continued from Saturday night; going to a village a few miles off on Sunday morning, and staying there till Monday; gathering “grozers” [gooseberries] in time of sermon; carrying a letter from the Earl Marischal to his bailiff. The observance of the day appears to have reached its greatest rigour about 1651, when it was forbidden to walk for health or recreation *after* service; and a woman was punished for going from New to Old Aberdeen “*between* sermons<sup>4</sup>.”

Rural lairds, who when at home were perhaps not properly subdued to the “Mass Johns” of their respective parishes, gave offence to the session by “dishaunting” of sermons during their occasional residences at Aberdeen; and in 1607 it was ordered that such lairds, and also unchurch-going “skippers,” should be admonished, and, if refractory, should be banished from the town<sup>5</sup>.

Country gentlemen appear to have been fond of causing things to be transported on Sunday; sometimes, perhaps, out of irreligion, sometimes out of popery. In 1602 the Earl Marischal is very politely requested “that his lordship cause not his tenants to raise or transport any carriage on the Sabbath<sup>6</sup>.” The laird of Avachie is summoned before the Strathbogie presbytery in 1652, for “going upon a Sabbath-day before the sun set, with a great company of horse and litters, towards Murray, for bringing along of a millstone<sup>7</sup> ;” and in 1668 it is represented to the synod

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 51.<sup>2</sup> Eccl. Rec. 65.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 234.<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 115.<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 58.<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 189.<sup>7</sup> Strathb. 223.

that "the Lord's-day was much profaned by carriages in transporting of timber and other commodities, conveyed by those who are servants to papists; and those servants, being reprehended, do declare that they are so commanded by their masters'." We ought to mention that at that date some regulations laid down by the bishop and synod in 1662 had put the observance of the day on a more Christian footing<sup>6</sup>.

Mr. Stuart remarks, in his preface to the Ecclesiastical Records, that "it is curious to observe how frequently the outrages which are noticed in the volume occurred on Sunday, and during the performance of Divine worship'." It is curious, undoubtedly; and shows that the severe notions as to the sanctity of the day, which were inculcated by the Scotch discipline, were insufficient to restrain the passions of a rude and lawless people; but we cannot wonder that in country parishes, where feuds existed between the local potentates, and one man's quarrel bound many others, the church, as the place of general meeting, and the Lord's-day, as the time which brought all together, should give occasion to deeds of violence. Laird would meet hostile laird and glare upon him in the kirkyard; Capulet-and-Montagu passages of taunting would take place between their followers; swords would fly out on slight provocation, with serious or fatal results. So well was this course of things understood from experience, that in 1592 an Act of Parliament was passed, which recites in its opening that "commonly all revenges of quarrels and deadly feuds is now execute in kirks or kirkyards, at the time appointed to the service of God and teaching of His holy word therein'."

We sometimes find things charged as offences against the Sabbath which in the view of our modern courts would rather come under the head of assaults. Thus, Walter Chalmer is charged with striking a woman on the Sabbath-day "to the effusion of her blood." His defence is, that she and her husband

"were both his servants, and, being drunk, had made a play in his house, and he could not get them rid until the time that he was forced after that manner to separate them; and that they had abused him with words, and had rent his clothes. Always," says the record, "the brethren present thought him to be *ane rough ridder*, and ordained him, for the brack of the Sabbath, to mak his repentance, and pay four marks penalty<sup>8</sup>."

The records after the Reformation, being of professedly ecclesiastical bodies, bring before us many instances of penance for offences of which, as we have already observed, the burgh authorities in earlier days took no cognizance. The manner of penance

<sup>6</sup> Eccl. Rec. 285.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Eccl. Rec. 271.

<sup>9</sup> Strathb. 27.

<sup>7</sup> P. lv.

was, of course, considerably altered. The offering of wax to the patron saint was omitted; so, too, were such symbolical actions as the presenting a knife to the person offended in cases of assault. Nor is it any longer directed that the culprit shall desire the intercession of "the good men of the town" in order to his forgiveness.

The use of sackcloth, however, was still retained in the severer penances; the feet or legs were still bared in some cases; and the new ignominy of a paper crown, with a statement of the offence written on it, was introduced. A "stool of repentance" was erected in the middle of every church, and on this the penitents took their place during the service. In cases of heavy transgression, they were also obliged to exhibit themselves at the church-door while the congregation was assembling and dispersing.

In 1608 there is an order for preventing the attempts of frail females to avoid any portion of the shame connected with the exposure on the stool:—

"The ministers and session ordains that in time coming na woman be suffered to sit on the pillar of repentance having ony plaids about her; but that her plaids be taken from her immediately before her up-ganging to the pillar; and that because in times past the most part of women sat thereon having their plaids about their head, coming down over their faces the haill time of their sitting on the stool, so that almost nane of the congregation could see their faces, or know wha they were, whereby they made na account of coming to the stool, but misregarded the same, and thereby were made to persevere in their wickedness<sup>1</sup>."

This order was renewed in 1651.

On the other hand, some offenders attempted to brazen the matter out, so that their penance became far from edifying. Thus, James Riauch "was observed by certain honest persons that he did mak ane mock of repentance, by putting in of sneishen [snuff] in his eyes, to mak them tear, and by laughing upon several persons in public<sup>2</sup>."

Besides these punishments, the session and presbytery inflicted some of less solemn character, such as ducking, "riding the mare," carting through the town, "standing on ane barrel-head with the dittay [accusation] on the breast," clipping of hair, whipping, confinement in branks and jogs (stocks), imprisonment in the kirk vault (once the chapel of Our Lady of Pity), and in the steeple.

The offences which are most frequently mentioned as subjects of penance are breaches of the seventh commandment: one of the Strathbogie ministers complains that he cannot persuade his elders to concern themselves with inquisition into any other class of sins.

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Rec. 62. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 136.

The penalties appear to have become heavier in the course of years. Thus we find a man sentenced at Aberdeen in 1598 to stand thirteen Sundays in sackcloth for the same offence which at Dumbennand in 1645 was visited with more than a year and a half of similar penance.

The evidence of these papers is, in its general effect, by no means favourable to the expediency of such a system of discipline. The exposure must, no doubt, have been disagreeable to the sinners; but it does not appear to have in any degree checked the frequency of the sin. The quantity of immorality is really prodigious. In Strathbogie, for example, at a meeting of the presbytery on September 16, 1646, no fewer than thirty-one persons are mentioned as in various stages of discipline for sins of uncleanness; and at the next meeting, only a fortnight later, there is a still greater press of such business, much of it being new within the interval. We find frequent mention of strangely-named repetitions of transgression—"trelapse, quadrilapse, quintilapse, sextilapse, octolapse". Often, too, there are circumstances which give a darker and more horrible character to the case. And while the stool of repentance was ineffectual towards preventing the repetition of sin in persons who had once been guilty, or towards deterring others from the like offences, it sometimes drove those who had committed a breach of chastity to attempt the concealment of their shame by further evil. The Strathbogie volume contains an account of a sister of the goodman of Bel-dornie, who killed her child, which was certainly illegitimate, and probably the offspring of incest. Being detected in her crime, she threw herself from a height, and died in consequence of the fall, without making any proper confession. And it is well worthy of consideration, that the severe statute of 1690, on which Scott founded the most powerful and most truthful of his tales, was passed because the dread of public penance had rendered child-murder fearfully common<sup>3</sup>.

The male offenders who were censured often conducted themselves with great hardihood. We have already seen how James Riauch behaved on the stool of repentance. Gilbert Keith (the same who kindled bonfires on Midsummer-eve), being accused of certain offences, which we need not particularize,

"gave no signs of repentance, but rather rejoiced in his sin, saying he was glad he was accused of a fault committed by him twa years since, and gif they had sperit [asked] at him sooner he would have told them of fifty mair faults; offering only to gang to the stool, but refusing to pay ony pecunial paine to the poor<sup>4</sup>."

<sup>3</sup> Strathb. 289.

<sup>4</sup> Note on the Heart of Midlothian, Wav. Novels, xii. 21, ed. 1830.

<sup>5</sup> Eccl. Rec. 46.

In 1656 we find Patrick Whyte in trouble for saying that "he cared not for the sentence of excommunication the less<sup>6</sup>." William Christie, being ordered to take back his wife, and dismiss a woman with whom he was cohabiting, declared that "he would not receive his wife again for any man that spak with ane tounge<sup>7</sup>." And contumacy and contempt are frequently mentioned as offences, although without any detail of the circumstances.

Cursing and swearing are subjects of frequent censure. The Aberdeen session in 1623 empowered certain persons to punish all who should be heard to commit such sins in the streets, by exacting fourpence Scots from such as could afford to pay, and by administering to others a blow on the hand with a "palmer<sup>8</sup>." In the following year it was ordered that every head of a family should provide himself with one of the instruments just named, in order to correct any profane language in members of his household<sup>9</sup>. We also meet with censures on drunkenness, scolding, keeping company with fairies, speaking against the ministers, "ryming and cuculling<sup>1</sup>" (misdemeanors which we do not profess to understand), fostering children of unknown parentage, slander, and scandal-bearing. It was hardly fair that the ecclesiastical tribunals should be severe on this last offence; for they had unquestionably no small share in encouraging it.

The practice of witchcraft and kindred arts is often called in question before the kirk<sup>2</sup>; and in many instances, to the credit of the judges, severe punishment was inflicted on persons who had maliciously accused their neighbours of such things<sup>3</sup>. Other instances of superstition are also mentioned: such as, pilgrimages to wells of ancient fame for holiness; bathing or washing children in them; pilgrimages to certain ruined churches and chapels; using a touchstone belonging to Mr. Menzies of Pitfodels; "raising of neidfire," i. e. producing fire by the friction of two pieces of wood, in order to curing diseases of cattle<sup>4</sup>; and a strange practice, prevalent in Strathbogie, of leaving certain pieces of land uncultivated "for the auld goodman," i. e. for the purpose of propitiating the devil<sup>5</sup>.

The continued adherence of some persons to the Roman com-

<sup>6</sup> Eccl. Rec. 155.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. 13.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. 27.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. 194.

<sup>1</sup> Strathb. 242.

<sup>2</sup> Some very remarkable trials for witchcraft are given in the Spalding Miscellany, vol. i.

<sup>3</sup> Eccl. Rec. 29. 39. 48. 57. 70. 74. 81.

<sup>4</sup> "This superstition seems to have descended from pagan times, and was forbidden by a council held in the time of Charlemagne." Strathb. Pref. xv. A minister speaks of it as "a highland practice." Ibid. 117.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 71. 208, 209.



union, and the efforts which were perseveringly made for extending its influence, gave much trouble to the authorities of the kirk, whose mode of dealing with their adversaries was neither the most lenient nor the most judicious. On the side of the Romanists, we see crafty, underhand proceedings; on that of the Reformed, a prying and restless system of inquisition; each party provoking the other to carry further what was objectionable in its actings. The prevailing body was filled with the idea of a national religion from which there should be no dissent or separation; and such a thing is doubtless very desirable—provided always that this national religion be the true one. But,—while we are far from holding with the sage in Mrs. Barbauld's story, that "religion is a thing as to which it was never meant that people should agree," and therefore that no form of religion can have a claim to general acceptance,—we know from experience that it is a thing as to which people cannot be *driven* to agree; and we doubt very much whether such measures as those recorded in these volumes were at all likely to help towards any true or profitable unity.

In the early part of the Ecclesiastical Records, there are various cases of dealing with persons whose opinions lagged behind the time. In 1574, Jonet Maitland, being desired more than once to "refuse all points of papistry," "refused to give any resolute answer, but remained still stubborn." Marjory Urquhart is mentioned on the same day, as one who "refused all kind of papistry in all points now dampned by the Kirk of Scotland;" but some months later she appears to have desiderated in the reformed system that "something higher, deeper, and more poetical," of which we have lately heard so much. "She answered that she would not come to the communion, nor yet submit herself to the kirk, alleging she had sic ane pyk on her conscience, that she *could not be full of this present religion now in Scotland*."

Absence from preachings and from communion was noted as a ground for suspicion of popery, and the absentees were dealt with in various ways—being required to sit under sermons, to confer with ministers, to communicate regularly, to subscribe articles of faith, and bind themselves under a pecuniary penalty to perform the outward duties of conformity.

Among the offenders in this kind, we again meet with the somewhat disreputable Gilbert Keith, who, not content with entertaining unsound opinions and "dishaunting of ordinances," uttered "slandrous speeches against the true religion," and moreover broke the kirk windows, shut the kirk doors, (*per alium*, if not *per se*,) "minassed the elders of the congregation, and behaved



himself irreverently to the magistrates in the face of the court<sup>1</sup>. For these offences he once more underwent public penance.

Sometimes it was found that persons relapsed after engaging themselves to conform, as was the case about 1620 with some of the family of Menzies, whose attachment to Romanism runs like a thread through the records of the Aberdeen session. They and others being required in 1622 to attend at prayers, preachings, and communion, avowed that they were not of the established faith, but offered to resort to sermons for the sake of avoiding scandal. The session, "in so pertly allowed contrariety of religion," rejects the offer of a compromise, requires them to subscribe and communicate, and, "considering their allowed apostasy, and proud and insolent behaviour, intending nothing but ludification," threatens to excommunicate them unless they speedily conform. If we call to mind the position of affairs in England at the time, we shall better understand the course which was taken by the accused parties. They appealed to the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, alleging, among other things, that the securities required of them were beyond their means. The session objected to the appeal, inasmuch as it ought to have been made in the first instance to the bishop of the diocese, and not to the primate. The parties afterwards appealed to the king at London. The session invoked the Bishop of Aberdeen, who called the accused before him, rebuked them for their behaviour, and inquired whether they would bind themselves to become "ordinar hearers" and to communicate. They replied that they were willing to enter into an engagement, provided that the penalties were limited to such sums "as they would rather choose to pay the same than to join with us in any communion of our religion." In the course of the proceedings, they mentioned a report that "from his majesty a warrant was already come to Scotland, that no man should be processed or molested for his religion." The bishop told them that this was insolent ludification, and that they had now increased their offence by traducing the king; and they were excommunicated<sup>2</sup>.

Excommunications were pronounced with great formality and deliberation. On three successive Sundays, every minister of the presbytery in which the delinquent lived, delivered a solemn summons to repent. After this, a special prayer was used for three Sundays; and finally the sentence was uttered. The names of excommunicate persons were always recited before the administration of the Lord's Supper.

The civil consequences of excommunication appear to have been

<sup>1</sup> *Ecc. Rec.* 66, 67.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 109.

dreaded by persons who would have regarded the spiritual sentence as nugatory. Thus the fiar (or heir-apparent) of Gicht (ancestor of the poetical Lord Byron) was summoned in 1601 to "subscribe, swear, and communicate;" and, after many evasions, he was at length on the point of being denounced. He then wrote to the presbytery that he believed himself to be dying: he offers to confine himself within a mile of his own house, and to have no intercourse with excommunicate persons, excepting only his wife.

"I persuade myself, undoubtedly," he continues, "that ye will not be hasty in pronouncing the sentence of excommunication against me; for I know, undoubtedly, that sentence will prejudice my worldly estate, and will be a great motion to you of the kirk in Scotland to crave my blood. I here offer—gif there is nothing can satisfy you, gif I remain catholic, but my blood and worldly wreck—to enter myself, as I have said before, in ony place ye please to appoint; and gif it shall please majesty and your wisdoms of the Kirk of Scotland so to tak my blood for my profession, quhilk is Catholic Roman, I will most willingly offer it for the same; and gif so be, God grant me constancy to abide the same<sup>1</sup>!"

The pathetic tone of this letter made no impression on the members of the presbytery, who probably had reason to doubt the writer's sincerity. It is ordered that, unless he give speedy satisfaction, he shall be excommunicated without further delay; and at the next meeting, a week later, a new plea is put forward by the old laird of Gicht in his son's behalf—that he was under a requisition to answer in a matter of blood, "and gif the said George were excommunicate, he could not have *personam standi in judicio*." The brethren consider that he has not established a claim on their forbearance; and the last notice of him is an order that he be excommunicated throughout all the kirks of two presbyteries.

Intercourse with papists is an offence of which we meet with frequent mention; and this was prohibited even between near relations. Thus in 1604, Alexander Setoun was charged to avoid his nephew of the same name, "under pain to be punished as ane resetter and intercommuner with excommunicate papists." In the same year, the session requests the magistrates of Aberdeen to pass an order that no one within the burgh shall let a house to certain persons who are named (mostly lairds, or members of lairdly families), nor have any communication with them. In 1607, Thomas Menzies and others are called to account for intercourse with the younger Setoun; and in 1651, when discipline of all kinds

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Rec. 180.

was extremely strict, a woman was punished for "dwelling with excommunicate papists," by being compelled to appear before the pulpit in sackcloth, and openly ask pardon for her guilt<sup>2</sup>.

Foreign travel was regarded as a ground for suspicion of popery, which was sometimes borne out by the fact. In 1609, James Dun "granted that at his being forth of the country, he heard mass and took the sacrament thereat, and was sworn to the religion professed by the Paip, at the said James being in Rome<sup>3</sup>." The "petagogis" of Lord Gordon and the Master of Caithness<sup>4</sup> are examined in 1604 as to "their religion, and upbringing of the lord and maister aforesaid." They

"testified that they saw never ane other religion within this realm nor out of the same, except that the said Mr. John Sinclair declared that he, being in France by the space of twa years or thereby, could not have the sight of the king thereof, and upon the information and convoy of ane familiar of his, he saw the king at the messe, whereunto the said Mr. John gave na reverence; for his going thereto was but to get the sight of the king, and not of the messe, quhilk he abhors and detests fra his heart."

We then get this glimpse of the young noblemen's education:—

"They declared that they teached to them grammar and oratory, and on the Sunday a little catechism, and read to them the New Testament, and exponit the same to them." The presbytery "enjoined them to read and teach them the confession of Beza and the catechism of Calvin, and therewith to read ilk day twa chapters of the Bible, quhilk they promised to do."

Of the Master of Caithness we know nothing further; but the young Lord Gordon developes afterwards into a Marquis of Huntly, and it would seem that the lore of Calvin and Beza was altogether thrown away on him.

A similar anxiety as to the right training of young men of station was shown on other occasions. In 1663, a request is made to the primate of Scotland that he would move the king to restrain the custom of sending such youths abroad for education, "and that a solid way may be taken for training up the foresaid children in the Protestant religion, especially the young noble lord the Marquis of Huntly, and that the children already sent abroad be speedily reduced." And in 1678, the clergy are desired to

<sup>2</sup> Eccl. Rec. 33. 44. 56. 115.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 70.

<sup>4</sup> It is noticeable that the one is a Gordon, and the other a Sinclair; each a clansman of his employer. Eccl. Rec. 194.

inform the bishop, if they find that any persons are about to send their children to popish colleges<sup>5</sup>.

We have already had to notice the act of parliament for the suppression of Lutheran writings. At a later time, a like strictness was exercised against Romish books and symbols. In 1656, Thomas Moncurre and Patrick Whyte were charged with "transcribing books of popery, and spreading them, namely, one called the Rosary." Moncurre confessed that he had received the book "from one Jeane Cleve, an excommunicate papist;" that he gave it to Whyte to transcribe; "and that he desired the said Patrick Whyte to keep it secret, and to write the same at such hours as he might not be challenged, to wit, betwixt nine and ten, and twelve and one, and after six at night." The scribe was rebuked, and the employer excommunicated. Another person was charged, about the same time, with a similar offence<sup>6</sup>. John Melvill, in 1604, confessed himself guilty of having painted a crucifix for the funeral of Lady Gicht, and was allowed to escape on pleading the command of the young laird, a person not unknown to us already. In 1618, one Pantoun was let off under similar circumstances, on the ground that he was merely an amateur, and had painted a crucifix solely to oblige the son of the person at whose funeral it was displayed<sup>7</sup>. These painters might probably have met with harder measure if they had offended in 1640, when

"The session, understanding that some captains and gentlemen of the regiment of sojourns lying in this town had taen some offence at the portrait of Alexander Reid, some time of Pitfodels, as smelling somewhat of popery, and standing above the session-house door, for removing of the said offence, ordained the said portrait to be taen down, and not to be set up again<sup>8</sup>."

There appears to have been a considerable growth of Romanism about the time of Charles I. The zeal and activity of the Romish emissaries were increased, and the political circumstances of the day encouraged their efforts.

It is at this time that the extracts from the Strathbogie Register begin. The district to which they relate was under the influence of the great house of Gordon, at that time attached to the Romish faith. The Marquises of Huntly are felt throughout as overhanging and awing the presbytery.

One of the persons most frequently mentioned in connexion with the suspicion of popery, is the wife of the Laird of Fren-

<sup>5</sup> Eccl. Rec. 270. 324.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. 33. 86.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 137, 138. 140.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. 114.

draught,—a lady to whom our friend Blackhal refused to become chaplain, on account of the imputation which rested on her character, of having set fire to her husband's house, for the purpose of burning his guest, the Earl of Aboyne<sup>9</sup>. As a specimen of the manner in which the Romanists were dealt with, and of the evasions by which they endeavoured to baffle the puritan inquisitors, we may quote Mr. Stuart's abstract of this lady's affairs with the presbytery:—

“ After the fire, the laird removed to his house of Kinnairdie. The Lady Frendraught was at this house when she is first noticed in the present volume, and seems to have refused to attend the parish church of Abercherder. After a conference with her minister, we find that the lady ‘had resorted to the church, and promised so to continue.’ She and her daughter Elizabeth were then summoned for not hearing the word, and not communicating. After a long interval, she is ordered ‘to be dealt with,’ and her final answer obtained. It was then reported that ‘she promised to hear the word,’ and an endeavour is to be made to get her ‘to keep family worship with the rest of the family.’ She again promises to hear the word, and the General Assembly [the great kirk court for all Scotland] is consulted about her. In answer to another attempt, she says, that ‘she will go to the church to which her husband goes, which is not within the bounds of the presbytery of Strathbogie<sup>1</sup>.’ She gets liberty from the commissioners of the General Assembly to be ‘ane ordinary hearer at Forgue for a time.’ In 1647, it appears that the house of Frendraught had been rebuilt, and that she lived there ‘for the most part.’ In 1648, she is ordained to be summoned ‘for her avowed papistry, receipt of mass-priests, &c.’ In 1649, several steps are taken towards her excommunication. She, however, afterwards attends family worship in her own family, and ‘promises to hear sermon.’ In September, 1649, it is stated by the minister of Abercherder, that she had heard three sermons, ‘and so, as he thought, she intended to continue ane hearer.’ The presbytery were not satisfied with her hearing a sermon ‘now and then,’ and thought not ‘that kind of hearing satisfactory;’ they, therefore, required her to subscribe the covenant, and show her conformity with the Kirk of Scotland. This she refused to do, and her excommunication was ordered to be pronounced. In October, 1649, she promised ‘to tak the covenant, and consider the same.’ In March, 1650, we find that she was ‘ane ordinar hearer of the word, but was not fully satisfied for subscribing the covenant, and that the laird made other ministers to confer with her.’ In June of the same year she subscribed the solemn league and covenant, and abjured ‘popery in the several heads and articles in the

<sup>9</sup> Frendraught, by way of securing himself from the vengeance of the marquis, Lord Aboyne's father, attached himself to the covenanting party. His son became a royalist, an intimate friend of Montrose, and was created a viscount.

<sup>1</sup> Frendraught avoided the church of his own parish, out of unwillingness to meet the wife of a laird who had killed one of his sons. Strathb. 134. 136.

ional covenant.' About a year afterwards, it would appear that another conference took place, in which she satisfied the brethren; but, 1652, we find that she had 'relapsed to popery,' and that 'she was obstinate, declaring herself to be none of our church; and she would neither hear herself, nor suffer her daughters to hear; professing, moreover, that she repented of her former repentance more than of any sin that ever she committed, and thought she had reason to repent all her lifetime for subscribing the national covenant, and solemn league and covenant.' She was ordered to be excommunicated<sup>2</sup>."

When the kirk took to asserting itself by force of arms, political offences were added to the list of those which it punished with censures. The Strathbogie ministers explained the solemn league and covenant from the pulpit, and required their people to subscribe it. At first there was considerable hesitation in many parishes, but the covenant soon got the ascendancy, and those who demurred to it found themselves at the mercy of their ministers. A man was punished for daring to call "the Marquis of Argyle's covenant". In 1647 a number of persons are made to sign a paper expressive of contrition for having opposed the covenanting party and acceded to the late horrid rebellion"—i.e. for having been on the royal side; and they do penance in sackcloth for their fault'. See Mr. James Kennedy is obliged in 1651 "to compeer *in sacco* on his knees," and crave release from the sentence of excommunication passed on him for connexion with the Marquis of Montrose's interest, and for various acts of immorality. There is a similar association of charges against James Gordon of Merne—"relapse into rebellion with James Grahame" being the most grievous article in the estimation of the presbytery'. And when we read more than once of women put to penance for attaching themselves to soldiers of Montrose's army, we may see whether the severity of the judges were directed more against the moral or against the political transgression.

The undisturbed dominion of the presbyterians, however, was short. Unpleasant intimations of an English "sectarian" power soon cross the fair sky of their ascendancy. The synod of Aberdeen was on one occasion obliged by threats from the commander of the garrison to refrain from the consideration of a certain matter. Minorities were generally ready to invoke the secular authority. Some of the very ministers lapsed into independency, nor were they always willing to relinquish their prefer-

<sup>2</sup> Strathb. xvii. xviii.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, 77.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 43.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 179. 213.



ments in consequence. Independency and quakerism were now added to popery, as heresies to be searched out, preached against, and visited with censures.

Independency, too, professed a principle of general toleration which was most abhorrent to the presbyterian notions of unity and discipline. Alexander Gordon, servant to the laird of Pitfodels, was twice vainly summoned before the session of Aberdeen in 1653. On his appearance after the third citation,

“being demanded wherefore he did not compear sooner, he answered, that if it had not been to hold in the offiris paines [?] he had not compeared now, nor at all; and being demanded if he did acknowledge us to be ane judicatory, he answered, unless we was authorized by the commonwealth; and being demanded again if he was of our profession, he answered, he came not to give an acquittance; and all the time he carried himself uncivilly and upbraidingly, *thanking God that the times were not as formerly*.”

Nay, sometimes it would seem that the papists who were questioned disguised themselves under the form of the newly-sprung sectaries. Thus, William Gordon, who was deprived of the office of schoolmaster in one of the Strathbogie parishes on a charge of popery, gives in a paper which at first sight appears strongly independent in its language, but on closer examination we observe that it does not contain a word inconsistent with the tenets imputed to him; and, we are told, on hearing that he was to be excommunicated, “he looked very frowardly, and uttered himself most proudly and maliciously’.”

Meanwhile Romanism was gaining proselytes, especially among the female sex, as may be seen in the Aberdeen Records about 1657. One of these ladies behaved in a singularly contumacious manner:—

“Frances Man, being accused for popery, confessed she was a papist, and would avow and profess the same, and that she was a Roman Catholic, and did not haunt ordinances; and, being demanded if she would quit and forsake popery, answered [that she would] not. The session offered her a time, to be advised therewith. She answered, she would not have a time, seeing she has been a papist these seven years, and has served popish persons during that space, and absolutely refused to be reclaimed from that religion.”

Excommunication had now lost its terrors, for the civil penalties had disappeared. We even find a complaint in 1659 of “the great growth of popery, and insolency of papists, in many parts within the province; and that several excommunicate papists are

<sup>6</sup> Eccl. Rec. 121. Perhaps “to hold in the offiris paines” may mean *to keep within compass the officers’ penalties*—i. e. the charges for citations.

<sup>7</sup> Strathb. 222.

<sup>8</sup> Eccl. Rec. 142.



employed in public offices, such as notaries, messengers at arms, and collectors of excise." Indeed it was impossible to discover how far papists were employed; for we know from the unquestionable evidence of Blackhal that the clerk of the presbyterian synod himself was "Catholique in his heart."

In the days of the Usurpation, New Aberdeen was under the ecclesiastical rule of Mr. Andrew Cant, a narrow-minded, self-important, crotchety, and pragmatical old precisian, of whose self-seeking, meddling, and jobbing, good Spalding relates many details with humorous expressions of disgust. Cant took a very rigid view of the qualifications necessary for communicating, and endeavoured to establish a particular inquisition into the lives of all who might offer themselves. To this, and other proceedings of his, the magistrates of the town in 1655 objected as mischievous innovations; whereupon the session, which was under Cant's direction, replied in a paper of very wearisome length and wordiness; declaring the remonstrance to be "ane unnecessary and grossly Erastian encroachment, opening the door to all atheism and licentiousness, subverting all Church discipline, inductive to ane unavoidable confusion, full of unjust aspersions, provocative of heavy judgments," &c., and they conclude by suggesting that "the hand of Joab"—i. e. of papists and friends of papists—"is in this matter."

The question was carried before the synod, which on former occasions had shown itself nowise disposed to lend itself to Mr. Andrew's extravagances. The parties were invited to a friendly conference; Cant promised to attend; but, although repeatedly summoned, neither he nor any representative of his kirk session appeared. The synod was then about to go into the matter, "in a most sober, peaceable, and tender way;" but the interference of the commandant, which we have already mentioned, put a stop to their deliberations.

Cant was at this time the only minister in the town; and he was old and sickly. For these causes, together with his strict ideas as to the amount of preparation necessary, he had not administered the Lord's Supper for "a long time" in 1653. The magistrates in the following year resolved to procure an additional minister, and nominated a Mr. John Paterson. The session on this declared that "according to the laws of this nation, acts and constitution of the Kirk of Scotland, since anno 1649, and the constant practice observed in burgh and land," it "ought to have ane special interest in nominating and electing the ministers."

• Eccl. Rec. 127.

The magistrates' exercise of patronage was therefore objected to, and the matter appears to have slept for four years. The magistrates then (1658) attempted to establish two new ministers; Mr. Cant was by this time fairly worn out. The session agreed to the appointment of Mr. George Meldrum; but when Paterson was named as the other, a considerable party dissented; and their reasons were found to resolve themselves into the fact that Mr. Cant had objected to Paterson, and had declared a determination never to give him the right hand of fellowship as his colleague. The state of feeling in the town appears to have been very much distracted. The question was carried on for a long time, and at last was referred to the synod. The objectors fully admitted the high character and qualifications of Paterson, and had nothing to allege against him except "the old reverend man's" repugnance; and the old reverend man, although often urged, could never be brought to assign any grounds for his feeling. The synod ended the matter by declaring Paterson to be lawfully called, and ordering his induction.

It does not appear how long Mr. Cant's infirmities and fancies left Aberdeen without any administration of the Lord's Supper. In the early days of the Reformation, there is an order somewhere that there should be four communions yearly in the town, which, if we remember rightly, was the number appointed by Calvin for Geneva. But it would seem that in later years the usual number of celebrations was not above two at Aberdeen, and that country parishes were considered to be very fortunate if there was one communion a year in the Church. In the parish of Kinnellar—and that in 1676, in the days of episcopal government—there had been no administration for fifteen years, on account of the minister's infirmities<sup>1</sup>; and in one of the Strathbogie parishes, at an earlier date, it is mentioned that "it had not been celebrate but once thir [these] five or six years, and that the people were not oftener catechized than the communion was given."

The idea of making catechizing a prelude to communion, and of confining it to the seasons when this was about to be celebrated, appears to have been very common; and we have sufficient reason to know that superabundance of preaching and scantiness of catechizing generally went together in those times<sup>2</sup>, to the grievous injury of the people. We find, however, many attempts, during the period after the Reformation, to establish a system of more frequent and effectual catechizing.

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Rec. 310.

<sup>2</sup> Strathb. 143.

<sup>3</sup> See especially Archbishop Leighton's Charges.

In 1578 there is an order, very much like those of our own Church, that “the reader read ane portion of the catechism, and the bairns answer him; and that how oft the prayers be read on the Sunday in times coming<sup>4</sup>.” In 1602 the presbytery of Aberdeen directs that the ministers of the town shall expound the catechism to servants and others at seven o’clock on Sunday mornings, and that there shall be catechizing also every Thursday afternoon, at two<sup>5</sup>. In 1604 we meet with a noticeable provision that the ministers shall catechize on Thursday afternoons, “and this to continue, *in compensation of the morning sermons, until our people be better acquainted with the knowledge of the grounds of their salvation.*” There is, in the same year, an order for a curious exhibition on Sundays—“that at afternoon twa scholars of the English school shall stand up before the pulpit, the ane demanding, the other answering, and repeat publicly, with a loud voice, in audience of the people, the short catechism<sup>6</sup>.” In Strathbogie, the brethren report in 1648 that they “had appointed every Thursday in the week for catechizing and baptism of children<sup>7</sup>”; and we find notices elsewhere of a similar arrangement. In 1621 there is an order that the poor of Aberdeen shall be catechized by the reader of the parish church every Monday morning, when they receive their weekly allowance<sup>8</sup>.

The management of the poor was a matter of difficulty to the authorities of Aberdeen, as well as to the legislators of greater communities. Before the Reformation many of them picked up a livelihood by begging within the church (as is still the custom abroad). During a time of plague, in 1549,<sup>9</sup> it is ordered that the sacristan shall not allow them to advance beyond the door, and that the bailies shall expel from the town such beggars as are not natives, with a threat of branding them, if found again within it<sup>9</sup>. The kirk session manifesto of 1562 directs a provision for the native poor, in order “that at the kirk doors and in the common streets they be not tholit [suffered] to go, begging and crying daily without ceasing<sup>1</sup>.” In 1565 it was arranged that those who were not born within the town, or who had not, at least, resided there for seven years, should be expelled. The rest were divided into four classes—“babes, decayed householders, lame and impotent persons, and the decrepit and auld.” The babes were to be received into the houses of such as should be willing to take charge of them, and a general assessment was made for the relief of the

<sup>4</sup> Eccl. Rec. 23.

<sup>7</sup> Strathb. 86.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 190.

<sup>8</sup> Eccl. Rec. 98.

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Rec. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 36. 38.

<sup>9</sup> Burgh Reg. 274.

whole'. In 1574 it was ordered by the session that the alms gathered at the kirk door should "be given to honest decayed persons, and not to common beggars;" and in the same year some old monastic buildings, with the organs and stalls of the great church, were sold for the benefit of the poor.

In 1604 we discover that beggars were more desirous of the temporal relief which was to be obtained outside the kirk, than of the spiritual edification which was dispensed within. It was ordered that they should no longer be allowed to remain in the kirkyard during service, but should be compelled to listen to the sermons'. The order does not seem to have been long effectual, for four years later we find a repetition of it, with a lively description of the evils which rendered such enactments necessary—that

"great disorder falls out on the Sabbaths and week-days, in time of preaching and prayers, at the kirk doors and in the kirkyard, by occasion that a number of beggars sit in the kirkyard and at the kirk doors, begging thereat, and strives frequently about their alms given them, quhilk breeds not only a tumult amongst them, but they ban and blaspheme the name of God very bitterly, to the great grief of the hearers, and sklander of the congregation'."

In 1616 there is a fresh renewal of this order, and the magistrates and session "ordain intimation to be made out of pulpit that na beggars get any alms, except sic as bears the town's token'."

A functionary was specially devoted to the work of "expelling stranger beggars;" and in 1622 a fellow was deprived of this office, "in respect he is found guilty of taking *black mail* from the poor beggars, to suffer them to beg through the town."

In 1621 it was agreed, that the notables of the congregation should "stand at the kirk door *per vices*," to collect the voluntary gifts of the people, "for the help of the poor and the kirk-work'"; and we believe that this manner of gathering money for religious and charitable uses is still practised in Scotland, by the Church and other communities, as well as by the kirk.

We must not omit to state, to the credit of Reformed Aberdeen, that daily service appears to have been kept up in the parish church until the time of the Cantian ascendancy'. After the re-establishment of episcopacy, it is ordered that this should also be observed in other chief places of the diocese. The form then prescribed was, "The Liturgy of the old Psalm-book';" the

<sup>2</sup> Burgh Reg. 358.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 83.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. 98. 114, 115, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Eccl. Rec. 43.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 93.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 63.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 263.

same which was reprinted a few years ago, with the title of "John Knox's Liturgy;" and this must, no doubt, have been the form which was also used before the Great Rebellion.

The Strathbogie book gives us the fullest view of the way in which the affairs of a presbytery were conducted. There was one ordinary place of meeting, to which all kinds of business were brought; and besides this, there was an occasional visitation of the several parishes within the district. At these visitations there was a sermon by one of the ministers, on which his brethren afterwards delivered their judgments. The people of the parish were desired to report of their pastor, and the minister gave his testimony as to the character and efficiency of his lay elders, and the condition of the parish in general.

This system naturally sometimes called forth expressions of sentiment which were not altogether flattering to the clergy; and we need not point out how much it was fitted to foster a spirit of criticism as to sermons. Of this the volumes contain some curious specimens. Thus, in the Aberdeen Records, we find the following, of date 1604, as to the minister of a parish in which a potent laird resided:—

"It was heavily complained upon Mr. Richard Ross, minister at Drumoak, that he passed to the pulpit to preach rashly, but [i. e. without] meditation, and that his doctrine was not formal, either for the comfort nor for the edifying of sic ane notable congregation."

Various witnesses are called on to give their opinions respecting Mr. Richard; they all agree that more studious habits would probably be beneficial to him, and conducive to the improvement of his discourses<sup>9</sup>.

Of another Mr. Ross, one of the Strathbogie ministers, his elders reported, that "concerning literature he was very weak, and gave but little or no comfort in his ministry; but as concerning his life he was mended, and was blameless now in his conversation." Mr. Ross, on his part, "regratit [complained] that the parishioners frequented not the church, nor assisted his discipline, but despised him<sup>1</sup>." This poor man afterwards fell into a state of imbecility, and was superseded.

Of Mr. William Read it is complained, "that he taxed the faults of the parishioners bitterly, and not in the language of the Scripture, whereby the people, instead of being edified, were moved to laughter and derision<sup>2</sup>."

The number of deprivations in the Strathbogie annals is very remarkable; for there was no general ejection in consequence of

<sup>9</sup> Eccl. Rec. 196.

<sup>1</sup> Strathb. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Strathb. 4.

a change of the prevailing party, but a gradual turning out of one minister after another, by his own brethren. We are for the most part left to guess whether the grounds were theological, political, or moral; either the original record omits to state them, or the editor has thought it well to suppress them. Towards the latter end of the time, the reports as to the ministers are far more favourable than in the beginning.

When an incumbent was aged or infirm, the presbytery usually took measures for appointing an assistant. There is a rather curious case of a Mr. Irving, who is described as old, and as having some defect in his utterance. In 1650 the brethren heard him preach, and were well satisfied with him for themselves, but suggested the expediency of calling in "ane helper". On the next occasion, they "thought him lifeless in his application, and not applying himself to the times;" (a grievous defect in those stirring days!) "his speech also somewhat inarticulate." The elders of his parish, however,

"declared all in one voice that he was no worse in preaching than before, and that by him they were edified, and that he was blameless in his life and conversation. It being shown them that the brethren could not distinctly understand his expressions in many words, they answered, that through custom they understood him better than others".

We begin to admire the attachment of these people to the good old inarticulate man, and wonder how their ears should have escaped the common *pruritus* of the age; but, alas! a mean motive soon peeps out in explanation—that they wished to avoid the expense of paying an assistant, which would mainly have fallen upon the parish. The subject recurs in the following year, when the elders continue to declare themselves well satisfied with their pastor; "as for his probation", being acquainted with it for a long time, they understood it well enough, and it was no impediment to edifying." In 1653, there is the same scene as before; the parishioners contented (like the needy knife-grinder); the presbytery (like the friend of humanity) bent on rousing them to discontent. But in 1654, the curtain drops on the reverend brotherhood, determined to be trifled with no longer, calling on the elders severally to state what they will give towards paying an assistant, and on the minister to allow him a portion of his income<sup>3</sup>.

One of the inquiries as to the performances of the clergy usually related to the duty of visiting their parishioners. It

<sup>3</sup> Strathb. 135.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 149.

<sup>5</sup> i. e. Apparently, his *trial*, the impediment in his speech.

<sup>6</sup> P. 253.



appears from the reports, that one who paid a yearly visit to each house was held to fulfil the highest ideal of the pastoral character; and it is told of a minister, as something altogether unexampled, that "he visited the sick, being sent for, *and some even uncalled*, when he gat any notice that they were sick'."

It is remarked in the preface to the Strathbogie Register, that

"during the first seven years embraced in it, the established form of government was the episcopal; but no perceptible difference appears in the forms and proceedings adopted by the presbyterians, after that system was overturned; . . . . It may be inferred from many circumstances which occurred over the whole country, that the hold which the system had generally got in Scotland was but slight; and that it was founded and kept up fully as much from a motive of obedience to the crown, as from any preference of the principles of episcopacy<sup>7</sup>."

There was, indeed, the *name* of bishop through the whole period from the Reformation to the Rebellion; and from the year 1610, there was also the *order*, derived from the English Church. But the consecration of the bishops at that time, does not seem to have produced any important change in the administration of the church. The bishop appears as a permanent moderator among equals, rather than as a ruler over his clergy; and the form of worship continued as before, extremely unlike that of England. It was not until 1637, that the attempt was made to introduce a service book founded on the English, and every one knows that it utterly failed. Nor was the face of things much altered after the restoration of Charles II., when David Mitchell, a prebendary of Westminster, was consecrated to the bishopric of Aberdeen, in which he was soon followed by Burnet (uncle of the more cele-

<sup>7</sup> Strathb. 255. "After supper," says Boswell in his Tour to the Hebrides, "I talked of the assiduity of the Scottish [presbyterian] clergy, in visiting and privately instructing their parishioners, and observed how much in this they excelled the English clergy. Dr. Johnson would not let this pass. He tried to turn it off, by saying, 'There are different ways of instructing. Our clergy pray and preach.'" (Life of Johnson, ed. 1835, vol. iv. p. 276.) Whether it was really necessary for Johnson to avoid the point of Boswell's observation, with reference to the state of things in 1778—whether he knew enough of the actual working of either the English or the presbyterian system to argue the question on its real grounds—we do not undertake to say. At the present day, however, the case as to the two communions is very different. An excellent Scotch lady, resident in an English city, lately told us that a "free-kirk" relative, who was on a visit to her, after much ill-informed abuse of the Church, volunteered the observation—"But I must allow that the clergy here work ten times as much as ours do." Yet we believe that at this day the popular opinion of Scotland regards all but a handful of the English clergy as men wholly devoted to eating and drinking, hunting, shooting, dancing, and card-playing!

<sup>8</sup> P. ix.



brated Gilbert Burnet), and Seougal. The period, indeed, is marked in the annals of the synod by an earnest movement for *practical* reformation; by a more rational system of dealing with nonconformists of every kind; by an endeavour to enforce a general attention to the religious training of youth, and the duties of family religion; and by a greater regularity and solemnity in the public service of God. But the bishop still appears as little more than a moderator. Injunctions run in the form "It is appointed by the bishop with the consent of his brethren of the synod." Nothing beyond a profession of canonical obedience appears to have been required from ministers already in possession—no questions being asked as to the source from which their orders had been derived. And if any were deprived, it would seem to have been for the adoption of tenets which would equally have caused their ejection from a purely presbyterian ministry.

The form of service in the churches is thus prescribed:—

"The readers [for whom no ordination appears to have been held necessary] shall begin with a set form of prayer, especially the Lord's prayer. Thereafter they are to read some psalms, with some chapters of the Old Testament; thereafter, they are to rehearse the apostolic creed publicly, and in rehearsing of it to stand up. Afterwards they read some chapters of the New Testament, according to the appointment of the respective ministers; and last of all, they are to rehearse the ten commandments publicly<sup>9</sup>."

An English traveller must in those days have had great difficulty in recognizing, under the appearances which would have met his eye in Scotland, a church in communion with his own. Mr. Stuart has prefixed to the Ecclesiastical Records, some curious extracts from an account of Scotland by the Rev. Thomas Morrer, who visited that country as chaplain to an English regiment, a little before the Revolution; and most persons who read the details which are given by this writer, will probably agree with him in wondering why the presbyterians should have been so bitter against a system which, in all outward respects, differed so little from their own<sup>1</sup>.

Such as it was, the episcopal system appears to have gained a hold on the affections of the people of Aberdeen, while the fanatical hatred of it led in other parts of Scotland to those dark scenes of insurrection and oppression which history and fiction

<sup>9</sup> Eccl. Rec. 263.

<sup>1</sup> There is one remarkable point which is not mentioned either by Mr. Morrer or by the editor—that *confirmation* was not used by the bishops under the Restoration. We infer this from the manner in which the documents prescribe the duties of the clergy as to preparing young persons for their first communion.

have made familiar to every reader. It is shown in an earlier Spalding publication, that the settlement of the kirk in Aberdeenshire after the Revolution was a matter of great difficulty ; that the bulk of the people was opposed to presbyterianism, and that a considerable number of years passed away before it was firmly established. Nor, we believe, is there any part of Scotland in which the church has preserved through the succeeding times so large a proportion of adherents.

It would be vain to speculate what might have been the ecclesiastical appearance of Scotland at this day if the church had continued to be the established communion—whether it would have retained a character of its own, similar to that which prevailed under the Stuarts, or whether a gradual working might have produced in it a nearer conformity to the Church of England. It was in the years of hard and long-continued trial which followed the severance of its connexion with the State—it was under poverty, disabilities, and persecution—that the Church in Scotland acquired that character which has distinguished it in the more recent times.

---

ART. IV.—1. *Servia the youngest member of the European Family; or a Residence in Belgrade, and Travels in the Highlands and Woodlands of the Interior, during the years 1843 and 1844.* By ANDREW ARCHIBALD PATON, Esq. London: Longmans. 1845.

2. *A History of Servia and the Servian Revolution, translated from the German of Leopold Ranke.* By Mrs. ALEXANDER KERR. London: Murray. 1847.

THERE are many causes which render Servia, at the present moment, an object worthy of the deepest interest and sympathy to Western Europe, and, more especially, to England. It is with the avowed intention of arousing this interest, and kindling this sympathy, that the translator of Leopold Ranke's elaborate and spirit-stirring work, has undertaken the laborious task of rendering the learned German's narrative into her mother-tongue.

"Professor Ranke, in a letter to the translator of this work, expresses a hope, 'that his History of the Servians may excite in our mighty nation an interest for the Christians under Turkish rule.' This feeling influenced the translator in venturing upon a task, the difficulty of which would have induced her to shrink from it, had she not been animated and encouraged by an ardent hope of thus promoting the author's view."—Preface, p. vii.

"This history of Servia," she rightly observes, "as traced by Ranke, suggests the consideration of many and great truths, moral and political; but it is beyond the province of the translator to enter upon their discussion. It may, however, be permitted her to remark, that the subjection of Christian nations to the Infidel yoke, is matter not merely for regret, but a subject that calls for the active sympathy of the enlightened and powerful governments of Christendom. And in these days of enlightenment, when Missionaries are diffusing the doctrines of Christianity among the heathen in the remotest parts of the world, and the legislature is organizing a comprehensive educational scheme for the people at home, it is surely not unreasonable to hope that the condition of a Christian people so near to us as Servia, will excite the sympathy of their brethren in faith in this free country."—Ib. p. 10.

Reasonable as well as right it most assuredly is, and it shall not

be from any want of zeal on our part, if the good cause does not prosper. But it shall prosper; it must prosper. It is the cause of civilization against barbarism, of order against anarchy, of European freedom against Asiatic despotism, of the truth of Christianity against the falsehood of Mohammedanism. One nation of Christian heroes—for such the Servians may justly be called—has, after a long and fearful struggle, succeeded in obtaining valuable privileges, religious, civil, and political, from its Turkish oppressors. We hail it as the earnest of a noble harvest, as the dawn of a glorious day, as the pledge of the approaching downfall of the most unenlightened and unrelenting of the followers of the false prophet. We forget, perhaps, for a moment, the gulf which separates us whilst paying the homage of admiration to the renowned caliphs of Bagdad; we can scarcely even suppress a sigh when we read the fate of Granada; but what is there to excite either love or reverence in the ruthless tyrants of the house of Othman? Who can feel sympathy with the greatness or sorrow for the fall of the Turkish barbarians?

We have read of a princess—we cannot recall her name—an English princess, we think—who, in the fulness of her holy enthusiasm against the infidel spoilers of Christendom, expressed her readiness to act the part of the lowest menial in the camp of the faithful, if the monarchs could thereby be induced to forget their petty feuds, and join against the common enemy.

It lies now in the power of her descendant,—a princess endued with equal birth, and with far higher station, not only in this her own native land, but throughout the world,—to vindicate her claim to the title of Defender of the Faith, by protecting the Christian subjects of the Porte from oppression, by advancing their universal emancipation, and by taking the first opportunity offered by the brutality or the bad faith of the Turks, to drive them beyond the Bosphorus, aye, and further too. And there are many and weighty reasons for rendering such a course in itself just and expedient, more especially incumbent on England than on any other power.

Though the interference of Russia in favour of the Christian population has certainly proved most beneficial, yet her close proximity, her ambitious designs, her aversion to improvement and enlightenment, her internal government and her external relations, render her no suitable mediatrix in the valley of the Danube, or on the coasts of the *Ægean*.

The near vicinity of Austria is, in like manner, a grave objection; for where powerful protectors are separated merely by rivers from those whose cause they defend, it too frequently occurs

that the old story of the Saxons and Britons is acted over again; and we shall be the less inclined to admit the interference of the Court of Vienna, when we recollect the general character of her mock-patriarchal sway, the unscrupulous principles upon which her counsels are directed, the nature of the treatment which she has hitherto deemed it proper to bestow on the Slavonian race, and the important fact that, by subjecting Serbia in any extent to Austrian domination or Austrian influence, we should be assisting the spread of papal usurpation over regions which as yet are free from the sway of Rome.

The same religious objection would apply equally to France; and the Austrians would naturally object to see the political influence of the French assailing them in rear as well as front.

The geographical position of Russia, whilst it prevents her being able to offer any immediate relief to the Servians or their neighbours, would render her influence on the Danube an object of constant jealousy both to Austria and Russia, and interest both those powers in the cause of Turkish supremacy.

But none of these objections lie in the way of English mediation and English protection. Our aid could be speedily and effectually supplied at any moment, and it would endanger the safety of no other European state. We would, therefore, urge our government to take a more open, and decided, and prominent part than it has hitherto done, except in the case of the kingdom of Greece, in protecting the Christian subjects of Turkey; and, more especially for the present, in advancing the cause of Servian independence, in *conjunction*, if possible, but even then in *advance*, of the rest of Christendom. Let the eagles and the tri-color be seen in the host, but let the lion of England be clearly discernible in the van.

We shall now, however, endeavour to give some account of the people whose claims to sympathy and assistance we advocate—their country and their character, their past history and present condition.

As to the works which stand at the head of this article, Mr. Paton's is an easy and entertaining volume, full of amusing anecdote and valuable information; though we should have preferred in several instances a more subdued tone, especially when treating of sacred persons and things.

The "History of Serbia" is a work of great merit; but it is not free from faults. Whether some of these are attributable to the translator, or all of them to the author, we cannot say, as we have not the original before us. The Servian history would cer-

tainly have been more complete, had a page or two been devoted to the earlier annals of the Sclavonian race, and the immigration of the Servians themselves. A little more might have been said of the first days of their sojourn south of the Danube, their customs, laws, and religion. And in the latter portion of the work there is sometimes a good deal of obscurity, not only from the thorough Germanism of the style, but also from the omission of facts and explanations which are wanting to complete the picture. We would also observe, that a more clear and detailed account should have been given of the various institutions which are mentioned, and that more particular information regarding those at present in force would be desirable. And had a careful geographical sketch of the country (as far as was practicable) been given, we should have esteemed it a decided gain. Two other faults, and we have done. Though the author and translator may be capable of pronouncing the Servian names, it is too much to expect of the British public that, without even so much as an accent to guide them, they should accomplish such words as Natchalnick, Skuptschina, Nenadowitsch, Sowietnik.

And again, which is a far more serious affair, every Servian word, when appearing for the first time, should be fully explained, even a repetition of the corresponding English expression occasionally would be no harm; and a glossary at the end should assist the memory still further.

Despite, however, of these faults the work is full of interest, full of information, powerfully and vividly written, carefully impartial, and calculated to convey to the attentive reader deeper lessons than those of mere knowledge. As to the glossary, at any rate it could easily be made out, even now, added to the unsold copies, and distributed to the previous purchasers of the volume.

But to our task. The great Sclavonian race, branches of which still occupy large portions of Europe, did not attract the notice of our western ancestors until the fourth century of the Christian era. Jornandes, a Gothic writer of the seventh century, appears to be one of the first authors who mention them. He denominates them Slavi, or Slavini, and divides them into three principal branches, the Venedi, the Slavi, and the Antes, whose various tribes occupied the regions which lay between the Baltic and the Black Sea to the eastward of the Vistula and the Dniester. It was after the commencement of the sixth century that these nations emigrated from their former habitations, and spread themselves over the east and south of Europe. On the one side they extended their colonies as far as the Elbe and the Saal,

on the other they crossed the Danube, and penetrated into Northern Pannonia and Thracia, occupying all those countries known in after-times under the names of Hungary, Slavonia, Serbia, Bosnia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, and the March of the Veneti. The history of the sixth century presents nothing more memorable than the bloody wars which the emperors of the East had to maintain against the Slavians of the Danube.

"The most remarkable and significant epoch," says Ranke, "in the history of the Slavonian nations, is found towards the close of the ninth century. The migrations had ceased; immense tracts of country had been taken possession of; and these numerous tribes, of whose names the ancients were scarcely cognizant, had advanced some steps within the limits of historical and geographical recognition. Foreign rule, like that of the Avars, had been cast off; and the time was come for the Slavonians to raise themselves into independence, and to attempt political institutions. . . . Meanwhile the Slavonian apostles, Methodius and Cyrilus, traversed all the countries bordering on the Danube, and became distinguished from most of the early missionaries by their endeavours to elevate the standard of the national languages, by using them in the Church service. . . . In order to take a comprehensive view of ancient Serbia, we must survey the country from a central summit of that lofty range of mountains extending from the Alps to the Black Sea; the declivities of which, with the rivers and streams flowing from them, and the valleys they form, constitute the whole Servian territory between the Danube on the one side, and the Adriatic and the Archipelago on the other. The successive heights of these mountain ridges—described in the national songs as variegated woods, where the darkness of the forest is relieved only by white rocks, or by the unmelted snows—have ever been in possession of the Servians. They inhabited the country from the banks of the Drina and the Bosna, towards the Hæve, along the course of both Morawas, down to the Danube, and southerly to Upper Macedonia; peopling likewise the coasts of the Adriatic Sea. For centuries they lived under the government of their chieftains and elders, regardless of the policy of surrounding nations. . . . When they determined on acknowledging the supremacy of Constantinople, they did so only on condition that they should never be subject to a government proceeding from that capital, whose rule they abhorred, as being extortionate and rapacious. The emperor accordingly permitted the Servians to be ruled by native chiefs solely of their own election, who preserved a patriarchal form of government. The records of Christianity were also given them in their vernacular language and writing. . . . They likewise also enjoyed the advantage of a liturgy which was intelligible to them; and we find that early in the tenth century a considerable number of Slavonian priests, from all



the dioceses, were ordained by the Bishop of Nona, who was himself a Slavonian by descent.

"In the eleventh century the Greeks, despite the stipulations they had entered into, attempted to take Servia under their immediate control, and to subject it to their financial system. In pursuance of this design, a Greek governor was sent into the country. But the proceeding incited a general revolt. A Servian chief, Stephanboistlaw, who was imprisoned at Constantinople, found means to effect his escape, and returned to his native land. He quickly assembled the nation around him; and the Greek governor, with his dependants, who are represented to have been mercenary and tyrannical, like their master, were compelled to leave the country."—*Ranke's History of Servia*, pp. 1—8, *passim*.

In the year 1043 Constantine Monomachus sent a numerous army to reduce the Servians. The Greeks attempted to penetrate into the interior from the coast of the Adriatic; they were, however, opposed, and utterly defeated in the impassable defiles of the mountains. This defeat not only put a stop to further attempts at encroachment from Constantinople, but likewise firmly established the power of the grand shupanes. They eagerly sought to ally themselves in marriage with the princely houses of western Europe; and their chroniclers always mention such alliances with peculiar satisfaction. In their jealousy of Byzantine domination, they warmly cherished the alliance of Venice, and even offered to do homage to Frederic Barbarossa, an offer which, from prudential motives, that prince refused.

Neman the First appears to have been the earliest chief who assumed the regal title.

"The Servians had been taught Christianity by Greek teachers from Constantinople, at the very time when the schisms of the Latin and Greek Churches first broke forth. From the first they had imbibed the aversion entertained by the Anatolians [Easterns] towards the formulæ of the Western Church—an aversion which, where it has once taken root, has never been conquered. . . . But the Latin Church presented not only differences in doctrine, but also another system of life and of government, which depended chiefly on the distinction between the Church and the state. . . . In Servia a totally different state of things arose. From his favourite residence, the hermitage of Chilandar, St. Sawa, the son of Nemanja, promoted the work of his father, and in a truly patriotic spirit. The patriarch of Constantinople granted the Servians the privilege of always electing their archbishop from their own national priesthood. St. Sawa himself was the first archbishop."

The Servian kingdom, with various alternations of good and

evil fortune, was gradually extended by the successors of Neman and Sawa, until it attained its climax under Stephan Dushan, who, beginning his reign in the year 1336, overran in the course of four years the greater part of what is now called Turkey in Europe, and, having besieged the Emperor Andronicus in Thessalonica, compelled him to cede Albania and Macedonia. He assumed the title of "Emperor of the Roumelians, the Macedonian Christ-loving Czar," and began to wear the tiara; and as a consequence of the national independence, in a synod held at Pheræ, the assembled clergy of Dushan's empire elected as their chief a patriarch of their own. The Servian monarch was preparing to invade Thrace with eighty thousand men, and attempt the conquest of Constantinople, when death put an end to his career. It is perhaps idle to conjecture what might have been the future fate of Servia and of Europe generally, had he lived to complete his designs; yet we cannot help thinking that, humanly speaking, the Turks would have found more formidable adversaries in the vigorous freemen of a Servian monarchy than in the corrupted slaves who combined, only to disgrace them, the names of Greece and Rome.

"There exists a digest of the laws of Dushan, which, it must be regretted, is still but imperfectly known. It proves, however, that there was established in Servia an assembly, composed of clergy and laity, under the presidentship of the czar and the patriarch, which exercised the legislative power; that it was the province of this assembly to secure the possessions of the landholders, both great and small, from the encroachments of the supreme power, and, on the other hand, to protect the peasants from the arbitrary exactions of the landowners."—*Ranke*, p. 19.

Amongst these laws we find the following enactments, which show the high value set by the Servians upon female honour, and the just abhorrence entertained by their legislators against those who sullied it either by force or fraud.

"Rape was punished with cutting off the nose of the man; the girl received at the same time a third of the man's fortune as a compensation. Seduction, if not followed by marriage, was expiated by a pound of gold if the party were rich; half a pound of gold if the party were in mediocre circumstances; and cutting off the nose if the party were poor."—*Paton*, p. 226.

Urosh, the son of Stephan Dushan, was a weak prince, utterly incapable of keeping together the ill-cemented monarchy of his father, or opposing the progress of the victorious Turks. On his

death, the celebrated Knes Lasar ascended the throne—a just and pious prince, a brave, though unsuccessful warrior. After a series of losses and defeats, the Servians and their neighbours, lately their vassals, gave battle to the invaders on the field of Kossowa. This engagement, which took place on the 15th of June, 1389, decided the fate of Servia. Knes Lasar and Amurath both fell. But their successors, Stephan Lassarewitch and Bajazet, entered into an agreement which formally established the inferior position of Servia: The Servian prince gave his sister in marriage to the Sultan, and followed him in all his after-wars as a faithful vassal.

In 1444, however, a league was formed amongst the Christians, chiefly through the exertions of George Brankowitsch, prince of Servia; and the allies under the command of the celebrated Hunniades gained great advantages over the Turks, and compelled them to abandon the whole of Servia. But this glimpse of freedom was of short duration. The Christian princes treacherously broke their treaty with the sultan, and expiated their crime on the fatal field of Warna. And the Servians, though from a sense of honour and duty they refused to take part in the nefarious transaction, shared the melancholy fate of their less scrupulous associates. From that time the Slavonian race was subjected to the sultan.

The Turks, however, did not owe their conquest solely to the force of their arms. Aversion to the communion, and apprehension of the tyranny of Rome, had their full share in the matter.

“A Servian song relates that George Brankowitsch once inquired of John Hunyadi what he intended to do with regard to religion, should he prove victorious. Hunyadi did not deny that in such an event he should make the country Roman Catholic. Brankowitsch thereupon addressed the same question to the sultan, who answered that he would build a church near every mosque, and would leave the people at liberty to bow in the mosques, or to cross themselves in the churches, according to their respective creeds. . . . Brankowitsch, who, even when he was ninety years old, was urged to adopt the Western creed, stedfastly refused; and when, after his death, the females of his family went over to the Latin Church, their ruin was only hastened thereby. The last princess, Helena Palæologa, offered her country as a fief to the see of Rome,—an act which excited a rebellion of her subjects. The Servians themselves invited the Osmanlis into their fortresses, that they might not see their strongholds given over to a cardinal of the Romish Church.”

Throughout Bosnia the nobles adopted the Mahometan faith, and thus preserved their castles and estates. The mass of the people, however, remained true to their ancient faith, and thus,

in common with all the Christian subjects of the Turkish empire, became subject to all the disabilities and oppressions associated with the condition of *rayah*. In Herzegovina alone, of the surrounding countries, a few Christian chiefs maintained their ground, and obtained from the Porte an acknowledgment of their rights, which the paschas were compelled to respect.

“ In Servia Proper—on the Morawa, the Kolubara, and the Danube, the old system, on the contrary, was upheld in all its severity. The army of the grand signior almost every year traversed this country to the seat of war on the Hungarian frontier ; consequently independence could not be preserved. It appears, indeed, that the peasantry in the neighbourhood of Belgrade were summoned to Constantinople to render feudal service during the hay harvest, in the sultan’s meadows. The country was divided amongst the *spahis*, whom the inhabitants were bound, by the strictest enactments, to serve both in their persons and in their property. The Servians were not allowed to carry any weapons ; and in the disturbances which broke out we find them armed only with long staves. They would not keep horses, lest they should be robbed of them by the Turks. A traveller of the sixteenth century describes the people as poor captives, none of whom dared to lift up his head. Every five years the tribute of youths was collected—a severe and cruel exaction, which carried off the bloom and hope of the nation into the immediate service of the grand signior, and thus turned their own native strength against themselves.”—*Ranke*, p. 38.

At length, however, the progress of the Turks was checked by the arms of civilized Christendom, and the tide of conquest, which had hitherto flowed from west to east, began to take an opposite direction. By the liberation of Hungary from the Moslem yoke, a great part of the Servian nation, which had previously emigrated thither, was relieved from the oppression of the infidels. And the prospect of emancipation was eagerly hailed by their brethren south of the Save. In the year 1689 the Servians rose in support of the emperor ; their patriarch, Arseni Czernowich, leading them on by his example, with some thousands of the people bearing the ensign of the cross, he joined the imperial camp.

“ But Arseni Czernowich found himself, from the course of affairs, compelled to retire from his ancient archiepiscopal seat, and to migrate into Austria, which he did as a great national chief. Thirty-seven thousand families accompanied him, and settled in the Hungarian territory, where the emperor, by important privileges, secured for them their religious independence. . . . [The Turks] at once endeavoured to render all intercourse with him impracticable, and themselves appointed a Servian patriarch at Ipek. . . . On the advance of the Austrians in 1737 the Albanians and Servians once more rose in great numbers,

their force amounting, it is said, to 20,000; but they were met by the Turks near the Kolubara, and their entire force slaughtered."—*Ranke*, pp. 34—36.

The patriotism manifested on this and previous occasions by the Servian bishops determined the Turkish government, naturally enough, to forbid the election of another Servian patriarch.

"The dignity was united with that of the patriarch at Constantinople, over which the Porte exercised undisputed power. Greek bishops were in consequence placed over the Servian Church. This proved a heavy blow for the nation. With the independence of the Church, the people were deprived of their last remaining share in the conduct of public affairs, which itself had been in some measure instrumental in advancing civilization. They also for the first time found themselves wholly subject to the Turkish government at Constantinople."—*Ranke*, p. 87.

But the century which thus beheld the utter extinction of the last race of Servian liberty, was not to close without shedding a ray of hope on the Christian population of Turkey. When in the year 1770, the first Russian fleet appeared in the *Ægean* Sea, the Greeks rose with a resolution only too daring and premature, both in the islands and on the main land. Still more promising, at least for the Slavonian tribes of the interior, was the war which broke out in 1788. Austria and Russia united with the avowed object of destroying the Turkish dominion in Europe. The German emperor took a large number of Servians into his pay, and they fought bravely and well in the imperial ranks. For a time Servia was rescued from the infidels; the churches once more resounded with Christian worship; German civilization was making rapid way, and the dawn appeared to be spread out upon the Moesian mountains, when the selfish and timid policy of the western states of Europe induced them to advocate the cause of the Ottoman Porte, and to preserve the balance of power, and secure the alliance of Turkey against France. The Christians of the Danube were once more resigned to the will of the Moslems, doubly exasperated against their victims by the zeal and intrepidity which they had shown in the late war; and the oppression which followed was rendered even more insupportable by the recollection of the brief interval of peace and freedom.

Need we wonder that the blessing of heaven was withheld from the allied armies? or that the God of the captive and the oppressed permitted the infidels of the west to scourge those who had surrendered his defenceless children to the infidels of the east?

But though the sun of Servian liberty had not arisen, the brief

period of Austrian occupation may be fitly compared to the false dawn of the Indian morning, succeeded, indeed, by a recurrence of darkness, but surely announcing the approach of day.

“The Turkish commissioners who took possession of the country, expressed their astonishment, mingled with apprehension, of what might be the results when they beheld a Servian troop fully armed march out of a fortress which was to be delivered up to them, and perform with precision all the military evolutions of the imperial army. ‘Neighbours,’ cried one of them, ‘what have you made of our raja?’”—*Ranke*, p. 94.

Nor were their apprehensions unjust. Men who had been taught the blessings of freedom and the use of arms, were not likely to bear without a struggle the renewed oppression of their Turkish tyrants; and circumstances soon arose which both increased their wrongs and enabled them to redress them.

In the disturbances which took place between the Porte and the janisaries, during the reign of Selim the Third, none were more opposed to the sultan than those of Belgrade.

“Besides manifold other abuses which prevailed here as much as any where, the janisaries had entered into a sort of conflict with the rest of the Turkish population, the pachas, and the spahis; and it appeared as though they would inevitably acquire, by violent means, a tyrannical dominion over the country, to the exclusion of others of their countrymen. Already did their commanders designate themselves dahis, after the example of the deys of Barbary.”

After this fortress had been restored to him by the European powers, he determined, in this town at least, to rid himself of them. Ebu Bekir, the new pacha, was provided with a firman, which commanded them to quit both the town and the pachalic. They maintained their ground, however, so determinately, that he was compelled to use stratagem and violence. Deli Achmet, their principal chief, was assassinated by order of the pacha, and the firman was then published and enforced.

The spahis were now restored to the enjoyment of those emoluments which had been wrested from them by the janisaries and the Servians, who had emigrated, resumed their former property, whilst the possessions of the janisaries were confiscated, and they themselves driven out of the country. Under the government of Ebu Bekir, and his successor Hadschi Mustafa<sup>1</sup>, the raja dwelt in peace, happy to be ruled at length by mild and equitable laws. It was no disparagement to any one to have served under the

<sup>1</sup> Hadschi Mustafa evinced so much jealous care of the country, that he has been called *Srpska Maika*, the Servian Mother.



Emperor of Austria ; and Alena Nenadewitsch, who had held the rank of officer in the free corps, was made grand knez. The janisaries who had fled to Passan Oglu, the rebel chief of Widdin, attempted to invade the country. Hadschi Mustafa immediately armed the Servians, and, supported by them and his own troops, repelled the insurgents. But his triumph was of short duration. The bigotry of Islamism was aroused by his conduct ; the rebel chief was made pacha of Widdin, and the janisaries were restored to Belgrade by the authority of the sultan. And now the natural course of events followed. The worthy pacha attempted to punish a janisary for the murder of a Servian magistrate, who had refused to sanction an illegal extortion ; an insurrection took place ; Mustafa was murdered, and both rayah and spahis were subjected once more to the insupportable tyranny of the janisaries.

“ The janisaries informed the Porte : ‘ Hadschi Mustafa had been a false Turk, who had sided with the raja, and had now met his reward.’ They begged for a new pacha, not that it was their intention to obey him better ; they had committed murder in order to get the power into their own hands. Four chiefs of the janisaries . . . shared the supreme authority amongst themselves. They re-assumed the title of dahi. To each of them a certain part of the country was allotted. Yet they continued to hold councils together at Belgrade, whence they exercised a common power. . . . They fined and raised the poresa, and other imposts, and established a new system of government.”—*Ranke*, p. 115.

Besides janisaries, the dahis collected around them an armed force of Albanians and Bosnians, and appointed their creatures, men generally of rapacious and unprincipled character, to all offices of authority, trust, or emolument. They proceeded even to claim the actual proprietorship of the soil, hitherto vested in the sultan alone ; and, from time to time, built themselves stately country-houses.

A veteran Turkish officer of the late pacha’s concerted an insurrection against them, intending to lead both the rayah and spahis ; but the plot was discovered ; the spahis were expelled, and the rayah oppressed more cruelly than ever.

The subasches indulged in every sort of violence ;—

“ Frequently would they take from the peasant his festive garment, and use it as a covering for one of their horses. They disturbed the performance of divine service, they forced the women to dance the *kolo* before their own houses, and then carried off those who were the most beautiful. . . . The banished spahis, indeed, claimed assistance from Constantinople. The kneses, too, summoned sufficient resolution to assemble in a cloister, and there to draw up an address to the grand



signior. They complained that they had been shamefully plundered by the dahis, by whom they had been brought to such a state of poverty, that they were obliged to clothe themselves with mere *bast*; yet that, nevertheless, their oppressors were not satisfied; that they were attacked in their religion, their morality, and their honour. No husband was secure in the possession of his wife, no father of his daughter, no brother of his sister. . . . Their prayers did not remain unheeded" [supported as they were by the representations of the Turkish enemies of the dahis and their allies]. "He [the sultan] intimated to the dahis, that unless they changed their conduct, he would send an army against them; not, however, a Turkish army . . . but soldiers of other nations and of another creed; and that such evil should then befall them as had never yet befallen a Turk. On this intimation, the dahis asked one another, 'What army the grand signior could allude to, Austrians or Russians? It could not be believed that he would invite foreigners into the empire.' 'By Allah,' they exclaimed, 'he means the raja!'"—*Ranke*, p. 119.

To secure themselves from such an event, they resolved to go into the districts, and put to death every Servian who, from his eloquence, popularity, courage, wealth, or character, could ever become dangerous to them. It was in February, 1804, that they commenced this work of horror. At first they succeeded in their design without difficulty. No suspicion existing of their intention, as soon as they, or their subordinates, entered a village, the people came out to meet them, to supply them with food, or take charge of their horses. This offered a convenient occasion for seizing whomsoever they chose. Magistrates, priests, all whom they suspected, were slaughtered without mercy. Some, however, of the leading men, obtaining intelligence of their intentions, fled to the mountains, and amongst these was a swineherd, by name George Petrowitch, which signifies, George, the son of Peter; called by the Turks KARA GEORG, or Black George. He was driving his swine when they came to apprehend him; divining their object, he left his herd and fled.

The fugitives received a hearty welcome from the heyducs, a description of men peculiar to the state of the times; half robber, half patriot, resembling very closely those outlaws who, in the early days of Norman tyranny, took up their abode in merry Sherwood. The fugitives and their hosts immediately decided on attempting to expel the dahis from their native land. With the force and velocity of mountain torrents they poured into the plains of the Schumadia, and on their first success at Libnitz, the whole district rose to a man. The women and children were sent to the mountains, and couriers in every direction excited the people to revolt.

"At this news, the country on the further side of the Kolubara also rose. Jacob Nenadewitsch . . . most distinguished himself. Luka Sassarewitsch . . . regardless that he was a priest and wore a beard, took up arms. Of the heyducs of this district none was so dreaded as Kywitschia. He was a most expert marksman. The first shot he ever fired hit the target . . . . About the same time, a movement took place amongst the people on the further side of the Morawa . . . . In all the three districts the Turks had been simultaneously driven from the villages; nor did the conquerors long abstain from attacking the small towns called palanks. Even here they encountered no resistance . . . . The Turkish population hastened to take refuge in the fortified places . . . . In a moment, as it were, the whole country was in the hands of men who but a short time before had seemed doomed to extermination."—pp. 125-6.

The next proceeding of the Servians showed extreme wisdom; "every house," said they, "has a chief; the nation, also, ought to know whom it has to follow." Kara Georg was accordingly elected by the army of the Schumadia as their supreme leader.

The power of the dahis was not however yet broken, and their forces were soon increased by the arrival of Guschanz Ali at the head of one thousand kardschalics, a species of organized robbers, ready to serve the highest bidder. They did not however admit them into Belgrade, but gave them quarters in the suburbs.

The rebel ruler of Bosnia too, Ali Beg Wedaitsch, advanced to their relief at the head of an army which made sure of success. Stopping himself at Schabaz, he sent forward his troops against the Servians. By a clever stratagem they abandoned some untenable fortifications to the Turks, who proceeded to occupy them, and were immediately hemmed in without provisions, and threatened with certain destruction from the continual reinforcements of their enemies. They now declared that it had not been their intention to do more than ascertain the state of affairs. The Bosnians were thereupon allowed to disperse; but no quarter was given to the followers of the dahis. When they endeavoured to pass out with their allies, the consequence was, that not one man in ten of either of these parties escaped. The survivors returned to Losnitza with a very different estimation of the Servians from that which they had entertained on leaving it, and gave a most marvellous account of their courage and skill.

Prodigies of valour were now performed by the Servians; but for an account of the particulars of the war, the names of the heroes, and the nature of their exploits, we must refer our readers to Professor Ranke. After compelling Schabaz and Smederewo to accept their terms, the Servians concentrated the whole of their forces before Belgrade. Already some trustworthy Turks had

joined their ranks, and now the sultan, urged by the Turkish exiles, ordered Bekir, the pacha of Bosnia, to undertake the management of the whole affair, to banish the dahis, and restore peace. He now arrived before Belgrade with three thousand Bosnians, and was received by the Servians with every mark of respect.

The dahis in consternation proceeded with their remaining treasures down the Danube to Orshowa, instigated it would seem by Guschanz Ali, who immediately seized the citadel, and received the pacha of Bosnia into the town without any resistance.

The pacha gave up the dahis to the Servians, who shot them and their immediate followers, and he then desired them to lay down their arms. This, however, they were naturally disinclined to do without obtaining some security that they should not be oppressed for the future. After a good deal of distrust towards the Turks, and some discussion amongst themselves, they determined on soliciting the mediation, and if possible obtaining the guarantee, of a foreign power. Austria was first proposed, but they finally decided on applying to Russia. Their envoys were favourably received, and negotiations were entered into at Constantinople. They demanded an internal independence, a free administration of justice, the free exercise of their religion, the expulsion of the spahis, and permission not only to retain their arms, but also to garrison the fortresses. The Servians naturally endeavoured to obtain, and the sultan as naturally declined to grant, these concessions; nay, he proceeded to arrest the deputies, and desired Afis Pacha, of Nesch, to reduce the country to subjection. He was however repulsed on the frontier by Kara Georg, and shortly after died of mortification. In the meanwhile affairs in the south of Servia had proceeded most favourably under the command of Jacob Nenadewitsch.

Towards the close of the year 1805, hostilities broke out in every quarter between the Servians, who were in possession of the country, and the Turks, who remained in the fortresses. Incensed by the murder of the woiwode of Smederewo, the Servians having bombarded and taken the town, formally garrisoned it. Guschanz Ali now commenced hostilities against them, and the sultan showed himself determined to disarm and punish the refractory raja. Bekir, the vizier of Bosnia, and Ibrahim Pacha of Scutari, at the head of the bravest troops of the empire, were commanded to await the sultan's orders on different sides of the country. The Servians, on the other hand, prepared to defend themselves to the uttermost. Every man had become a warrior. In pressing cases each house sent forth into the field all those

who were capable of bearing arms ; in slighter emergencies, one out of two, or two out of three : if there were only one man in a house, he took his turn week by week with his neighbour ; and every means was taken to repel the enemy. The people were above either asking or receiving pay. Every man bore his own weapons, and appeared in his best attire, the women sending provisions after them.

The Bosnians now commenced their invasion, but with little effect. Nenadewitsch attempted to negotiate—an attempt which effected nothing, except exciting the distrust of the people towards their chiefs ; the cause of Servian liberty became in peril, the lives even of the leaders were endangered, and in many cases they fled to the mountains.

“The position of the Servians was indeed critical, when Ibrahim Pacha of Scutari appeared simultaneously on the other boundary near Nisch, with an army estimated at 40,000 men . . . . It was in this hour of danger that Kara Georg earned his fame and rank as commander-in-chief. He opposed to the great Bosnian army about 1500 men, under the command of Katitsch, who being in a favourable position, succeeded in detaining it for the moment, though not without the loss of their valiant leader himself.”

He advanced in person against Hadschi Beg, and repulsed him with great loss, and then occupying the districts lately conquered by the Bosnians, restored the native authority there, killing those who had submitted to the strangers or taken office under them, and rewarding the adherents of the popular cause. He now advanced against the enemy, inducing the people to rise again in every quarter.

“In a short time the Turks, threatened in the rear and on the flanks, judged it prudent to retreat to Schabaz. About an hour's march from that station, near Mischar, Kara Georg arrived with 7000 foot soldiers and 2000 horse ; and, agreeably to the mode of warfare in that country, he immediately threw up an intrenchment opposite to the encampment of the enemy. He had with him a bomb and three pieces of cannon. Affairs now approached to a decisive issue. The Turks had still sufficient pride to demand the submission of their opponents, and the surrender of their arms ; but the Servians boldly returned for answer, ‘If you will have our arms, here they are : come and take them.’ The Turks advanced. On two successive mornings they sallied forth from their camp near Schabaz, stormed the Servian works, fought throughout the day, and returned to their quarters in the evening without having gained any advantage. Astonished at their failure, they yet, from the superiority of their numbers, did not despair of the result. They then sent this message to the Servians : ‘For two days you have held out well ; but once more we will attack you with all our force : it

will then be determined whether we shall evacuate the country as far as the Drina, or drive you back to Smederewo.' They suffered numbers of persons from the further side of the Save to come over, in order that, on the hills and from the trees, they might see the battle. 'Now,' they boasted, 'they would show them in what manner they would treat the heyducs.' It was in the early part of August, 1806, that the two armies measured their strength. The night before the battle, Kara Georg sent his horsemen into an adjacent forest, directing them to attack the enemy's rear when the first shot was fired from his side, but not earlier. Within the works he commanded his troops not to fire before the Turks had approached so near that their aim should be certain. At break of day, the seraskier, with all his forces, went forth, the bravest begs of Bosnia carrying the standards before the army. With their pieces loaded, the Servians calmly awaited them. Not until the Turks had come within range of the Servian fire did Kara Georg give the appointed signal. All the front rank took aim: they hit, as these marksmen express it, 'all together into the flesh.' The standards fell. The utmost consternation was produced by the cannon. Immediately upon this the Servian horse issued from the rear, and fell upon the Turks. At the same moment Kara Georg sallied forth from the intrenchments, and, with his infantry, broke through the hostile ranks. In an instant the disorder of the Turks was complete, and their defeat decided. The most eminent commanders of their army,—Sinan, pacha of Goraschde, the kapetan of Derwenta, the seraskier himself, Kulin,—all perished! Here fell also at last Mehemet Kapetan, with two of his sons. The flower of the Bosnian youth had fallen around the standards."

Again were negotiations entered into at Constantinople, and the Servian cause was ably advocated by Peter Itschko, a Bulgarian, who had formerly acted as interpreter to the Turkish ambassador at Berlin. The Porte even proceeded to offer conditions of a perfectly satisfactory nature. Every thing that the Servians had asked was conceded. The progress, however, of Napoleon in the autumn of 1806 lessened the fear entertained by the Turks of the Russians, and the grand signior at the last moment refused to ratify the treaty. In the mean time universal success attended the Servian arms. Schabaz, Uschize, and Belgrade itself surrendered to them, and the country was once more in the possession of its lawful owners. Their triumph was, however, sullied by the plunder and massacre of the garrison of the capital, who had surrendered on conditions. It is fair to say that this measure was highly censured by many of the wisest and best amongst them; but its effects were extremely disastrous; for a set of worthless men became enriched by the spoil of the Turks, and obtained an influence in the councils of the state, which proved ruinously detrimental in the sequel.

And now, free from external oppression, the Servians attempted to form an internal government; in this, however, they were not eminently successful. We shall not detail the contests which arose between the various leaders, or the attempts made successively to control those prerogatives which were obnoxious to the leader, to his rivals, to the inferior chiefs, or to the people. A senate was formed; but it was of little use. A general assembly met once a year; but it did not effect much. By degrees, however, the power of Kara Georg became firmer and fuller, and the country seemed in some danger of finding in him an absolute monarch. Yet we must be careful not to blame him unjustly; a strong hand was required to rule a people all of whom were warriors; and it was impossible that a nation which had been subjected to the yoke of Turkey, and had fought its way to independence, should at once adopt either the form or the reality of European freedom. Many important steps were, however, taken towards a better state of things.

“Not only was a small school established in every district town, to afford some elementary instruction, but also, at the suggestion of Jugovitch, a high school (*Welika Sehkola*) with three teachers was established at Belgrade, where historical and mathematical science, and even the elements of jurisprudence, were taught. . . . Still more important at that time was the establishment of courts of justice. A small extent of jurisdiction was left to the *kmetes* of the village; but in every district town where formerly the *kadi* had resided, a magistracy was formed, consisting of a president, an assessor, and a secretary.”—*Ibid.*, p. 194.

And notwithstanding the dissensions subsisting between various parties in the state, the Servians made continual progress towards national unity—that essential requisite for the prosperity and the very existence of a people.

“Kara Georg,” says Ranke, “will be ever memorable, not only as having led the insurrection against the Turks, but also as the founder of a comprehensive national authority throughout the country. He well deserved to be regarded as the chief of the nation.”

A description of the character and appearance of the liberator will be welcome to our readers.

“Splendour and magnificence he despised. In the days of his greatest success he was always seen in his old blue trowsers, in his worn-out short pelt, and his well-known black cap. His daughter, even whilst her father was in the exercise of princely authority, was seen to carry her water-vessel, like other girls in the village. Yet, strange to say, he was not insensible to the charms of gold. In Topola



he might have been taken for a peasant. With his momkes, he would clear a piece of forest land, or conduct water to a mill; and then they would fish together in the brook Jasenitza. He ploughed and tilled the ground, and spoiled the insignia of the Russian order with which he had been decorated, whilst putting a hoop on a cask. It was in battle only that he appeared a warrior. When the Servians saw him approach, surrounded by his momkes, they took fresh courage. Of lofty stature, spare, and broad-shouldered, his face seamed by a large scar, and enlivened with sparkling, deep-set eyes, he could not fail to be instantly recognized. He would spring from his horse, for he preferred fighting on foot; and though his right hand had been disabled from a wound received when a heyduc, he contrived to use his rifle most skilfully. Wherever he appeared, the Turks became panic-stricken; for victory was believed to be invariably his companion. In the affairs of peace, Kara Georg evinced, as has been shown, a decided inclination for a regular course of proceeding; and although he could not himself write, he was fond of having business carried on in writing. He allowed matters to follow their own course for a long time together; but, if they were carried too far, his very justice was violent and terrible. His only brother, presuming on his name and relationship, took unwarrantable licence, and for a long time Kara Georg overlooked his misconduct; but at length he did violence to a young maiden, whose friends complained loudly, exclaiming that it was for crimes of such a character that the nation had risen against the Turks. Kara Georg was so greatly enraged at this vile deed, that he ordered this only brother, whom he loved, to be hanged at the door of the house; and forbade his mother to mourn outwardly for this death of her son!"

It is not for us to describe the details of the war, which, with varied success, was still kept up between the Servians and their late oppressors. At length in 1810 an additional impulse was given by the aid of the Russians, who had for some time exercised a powerful influence in the Servian councils. A formidable invasion of the forces of the sultan was repulsed; and though for two successive years Servia had been obliged to fight for her very existence, she found herself at the close of the campaign stronger than ever.

"She was not again limited to the pachalic of Belgrade; on the contrary, she had acquired districts from all the pachalics and sandschaks around her: from Widdin, the Kraina, Kliutsch, and Zrnareka; from Nisch, the towns and territory of Alexinaz and Bania; from Leskowaz, Parakyn, and Kruschewaz; from Nowipasar, the long celebrated cloister of Studenitza, from which a nahia was once more named; from Swor-wik in Bosnia, at least the districts on this side of the Drina, Jadar, and Radjewina."

The influence of Kara Georg continued now constantly to in-



use, until he became to all intents and purposes supreme head of the state; and in 1811 the Turks did not appear disinclined to acknowledge the young state of Servia under certain restrictions. But the terms could not be agreed upon, especially as the Porte demanded that the Servians should lay down their arms; and had they yet obtained that most necessary safeguard of their rights, the guarantee of a foreign power.

In 1812 the treaty of Brecharest was concluded between Russia and the sultan; and in this the Servians were expressly mentioned. But the conditions were so meagre, and the terms so vague, that in 1813 the war broke out again in all its fury.

'Determined to maintain the privileges of Islamism undiminished within the boundaries of the empire, the Turkish army advanced towards the Servian frontier, and re-commenced the war.'

Important posts had been entrusted to incompetent persons. Several of the great chiefs were in exile. The men who had risen to power by the plunder of the garrison of Belgrade were incapable of resisting the enemy either in the council or the field, and an unaccountable indolence appeared to take possession of Kara Georg himself. Terrified by the rapid advance and continual successes of the Turks, and no longer supported by the courage of their chiefs, or cheered and directed by their hitherto invulnerable leader, a panic seized the whole nation, and the army, without one great battle, reconquered the country. The fortresses surrendered one after the other. The crescent once more waved triumphant from the walls of Belgrade; and Kara Georg, with almost all the Servian chiefs, crossed over into the Austrian territory.

'Had the Servian power been so completely destroyed by a single campaign, which had not produced even one great defeat, and by the flight of the leaders, that it was no longer capable of inspiring fear? During nine years it had maintained its position amidst the most severe afflictions; and was it now to be all at once annihilated? It was a circumstance of vast importance in such considerations that there still remained some woiwodes who had not fled; and that of the independent estates—the gospodars,—at least one was left—Milosch Obrenowitsch. When the army of Schabaz dispersed, and so many of the woiwodes escaped over the Save, Milosch Obrenowitsch alone, of all number, continued on the Servian side of the river, mourning over the past,—meditating on the future. As he rode along the bank of the river, Jacob Nenadowitsch once more came over to Sabreschje, where Milosch had stopped to refresh his horses, and tried to persuade him to seek safety in flight. 'What will my life profit me in Austria,' he answered, 'while in the mean time the enemy will sell into slavery my wife and child, and my aged mother? No! whatever may be the fate

of my fellow-countrymen, shall be mine also !' The feeling of Milosch was, that a man should not desert his country in the hour of her misfortune."

As Kara Georg had been evidently formed by Providence for the part which he acted, so was MILOSCH as clearly designed for that which he had to perform. At first he appears to have meditated resistance; but the garrison which he had placed in Uschize fled at the approach of the conquerors, and he immediately accepted the proposals made to him. They promised that if he would surrender, and assist them in quieting the people, they would make him a *knes* and a governor, as he had been under Kara Georg. The conditions were mutually observed; and Milosch played his game with such consummate skill, that he obtained the favour of the Turks without losing the affection of the Servians. The conduct of the conquerors, however, soon placed him in a very different position. A slight insurrectionary movement had been put down by his means; and now, in violation of a direct promise,

"the less influential of the prisoners, to the number of a hundred and fifty, were beheaded in front of the four gates of the city. The *igoumen* of Trnawa, with thirty-six others, were impaled. These were all young, high-spirited, and brave men, of good descent, who had been amongst the first to join the insurrection, and whose influence in the country induced the Turks to put them to death. In accordance with this cruel chastisement was the reckless tyranny by which the Turks thought to prevent further movements. Whilst again searching diligently for arms,—for the insurrection had proved that there were still many weapons concealed,—they perpetrated innumerable outrages. Some were bound hand and foot, and thus suspended by the extremities, with heavy stones hung from the middle of their bodies; some were flogged to death; others roasted alive on spits. Many other atrocities are known to have been perpetrated, which we must pass over in silence."—*Ranke*, p. 302.

In addition to patriotic reasons, Milosch now found that his own life was in danger. He made his escape therefore from Belgrade, and arriving in safety at his own house in the mountains, where he found a considerable force already assembled, he placed himself at the head of a general insurrection. We can confidently assert, that in the whole course of the history of mankind, there is no page which we can look on with more satisfaction, than that which describes the Revolution of Milosch. The Servians had been driven to insurrection by the most horrible atrocities which it is possible to conceive—and what was the return which they made? The murder of Tokatlitsch is the only act of treachery

which they committed. Milosch carefully prevented all outrage on the part of his troops; he treated the Turkish officers who fell into his hands with the greatest kindness and respect; he strongly forbade all massacre and all plunder, and on one occasion, when the wives and daughters of his enemies fell into his hands after a hard-fought battle, he sent them carefully guarded into the territory occupied by the Turks,—conduct which called forth from the Turkish ladies the acknowledgment, “they had been treated as though they had been their mothers and sisters:—a religion which commanded such conduct, must be the true one.”

Surely, amongst the long list of those warriors who have fought the battles of freedom or maintained the cause of the cross, there are few to compete with and none to surpass Milosch Obrenowitch; his name may justly rank with those of Edward Plantagenet and Pierre de Bayard.

Commencing in Rudnick, the district of Milosch, the revolt spread throughout the whole country. The details are extremely interesting, but we have not space to insert them. Suffice it to say, that by the end of the campaign, the open country was once more in the hands of the Servians. And now—

“two formidable armies appeared: one from Roumelia, under Maraschli Ali, in the neighbourhood of Kyupria; the other on the Drina, under the command of the same Churschiel who had conquered the Servians in 1813, and who at that time governed Bosnia in capacity of vizier.”

Induced, however, by prudential considerations, the sultan once more entered into negotiations with the insurgents. Churschiel was less inclined to yield to the Servian demands than Maraschli Ali, and to him consequently Milosch addressed himself. At length the sultan despatched to the pacha a firman of peace thus worded: “That as God had entrusted his subjects to the sultan, so the sultan recommended them to the pacha; and that by kind treatment towards them he would best perform his duty.” The Servians now, therefore, allowed the pacha to proceed to Belgrade with his army, and thither Milosch and the other chiefs resorted, and formally acknowledged their subjection to the Porte.

Suspensions soon, however, arose, that the pacha was merely temporizing with the view of reducing the Servians once more to their original state of subjection, and at length he demanded that they should lay down their arms. But the power of Milosch was every day gaining ground. His three most powerful rivals, Moler, president of the Chancery; Niktschitsch, a Servian bishop; and Kara Georg, who entered the country with the view of raising an open insurrection, which the hetæria intended to spread through

the whole of Turkey in Europe, had been all executed by the command or at the suggestion of Milosch; and freed from all who could have opposed his influence, he determined to become the head of the nation.

"In November, 1817, he was acknowledged supreme *knes* (*verhowni knes*) by all the *kneses* of the country. The Metropolitans of Belgrade and Uschize, Agathangel, and Gerasim, both of them Greeks, and three Servian Archimandrites, were present, and assisted at the nomination. It was even settled that after his death, his next relations should succeed him."

And new powers, too, were granted him by the Porte. At length, in 1820, the sultan endeavoured to bring matters to a close, and issued a firman stating what concessions he was disposed to grant; they were not, however, satisfactory to the Servians, and negotiations consequently still continued to be carried on. At the same time various attempts were made by those Servians who objected to Milosch's administration, to control his power, but like all unsuccessful endeavours of the kind, they only increased and consolidated his authority. And now the progress of the Greek Revolution warned the Porte of the danger of exasperating the people of Servia, and the Russians, in the conference of Akjirman, demanded the fulfilment of the eighth article of the treaty of Bucharest, and at length succeeded in enforcing a peace on terms highly advantageous to the Servians.

"The sultan agreed, in the first place, that the authorities of the Sublime Porte should neither meddle with the administration, nor interfere in the quarrels of the Servian nation. The jurisdiction of the Musellims was now abolished by the express command of the grand signior. This jurisdiction, which the first pacha after the war had re-established in its widest extent, the second had limited; but it had, nevertheless, occasioned so much misunderstanding, that Milosch had already dispensed with it, in effect. The entire administration he left to the *knias*—as Milosch now officially styled himself—by whom it was to be conducted, with the assistance of the Council of Elders. But this would have been impracticable, had not a change been effected in the various imposts that were customary in the country; and which presupposed a direct inspection—nay, a personal interference—by the grand signior's officers. The sultan consented that the amount of the taxes should be fixed, and be delivered to him in one sum; in collecting which he was to be relieved from all trouble; that an estimate should be formed of the incomes of the *zaims* and *timariotes* throughout the pachalic, and the amount paid to him, together with the tribute. Thus their claims to the tithe and *glawnitza*, which they had exacted ever since the conquest of the country, were abolished; and it was left to the sultan to indemnify his vassals for their loss. It was also con-

sidered necessary entirely to separate the two populations; and the sultan ordered that no Turk should henceforth have a claim to the personal services of a Servian.\* But this regulation alone would have been futile, there being no one to enforce obedience; the sultan, therefore, judged it best to comply with the demands of the Servians, and absolutely forbid any Turks, not belonging to the garrisons of the fortresses, to remain in the country. To those who had landed property in Servia, a certain selling price was to be awarded by public functionaries appointed for the purpose. If any one were disinclined to part with his estates, he was not allowed to superintend them: the income derived therefrom was to be paid into the treasury at Belgrade, and thence remitted to the owner. . . . The army which had been settled in Servia—a warrior class, whose authority was grounded on the prerogatives of their religion, and who had hitherto governed the country—now lost their claim to personal dominion. The poll-tax, formerly the sign that a person belonged to the raja, was no longer paid—at least, not under that designation. Care was expressly taken that the Turkish officers, in their intercourse with the Servians in other provinces, should not demand any *teskeres* from them, but be satisfied with certificates from the Servian government. Thus the Servians continued to be tributary subjects to the Porte, but no longer formed a raja, or unarmed body, as hitherto. No distinction existed, with reference to apparel or dwellings; nor were arms any longer prohibited. Numerous churches were now built; and the *Haltescheriff* also contained a formal permission for the establishment of schools and hospitals, without requiring any previous application on the subject. In communicating these regulations, Milosch stated that divine service was allowed to be announced by the ringing of bells, and was to be performed in its ancient primitive solemnity without restriction. . . . It was desirable, too, to be freed from the Greek bishops, who had always been regarded as strangers; accordingly, in the *Haltescheriff* of 1830, the Servians were permitted to elect bishops and metropolitans from their own nation. To the patriarchal Church at Constantinople was reserved the right of confirming those elected; but the bishops were not obliged to proceed in person to the capital for that purpose.”—*Ranke*, pp. 375—379.

“Not only the inhabitants of the province of Belgrade—who had, in fact, been already emancipated—but those also who had joined Kara Georg, in his later campaigns, were to participate in these advantages. . . . In a conference held at Constantinople, on the twenty-fifth of May, 1833, the boundaries were agreed to by the Turks, according to the report of the commissioners. . . . The boundaries were fixed in conformity with the representation made when speaking of the conquests of Kara Georg. . . . It was estimated that the country and the people were augmented about one-third.”

Milosch was now elected knias, and the Porte made the dignity hereditary in his family; and, but for his own misconduct, the

house of Obrenowitsch might soon have taken its station amongst the princely dynasties of Europe. But, alas ! how far easier is it to create than to preserve, to acquire than to exercise, power ! He who had so long and so prudently steered his course to the supreme authority, through the greatest difficulties and the most appalling dangers—difficulties which would have defeated, dangers which would have unmanned most men—was unable to sit on that throne which he had so honourably toiled for and won. He to whom, under God, not merely the freedom but the very existence of the Servian people was owing, proceeded to rule them in a manner which necessarily excited the opposition of the lovers of their country. Let us not, however, be too harsh in judging him. In many things he showed great wisdom ; and we should always remember that the authority with which he was alone acquainted was that of a Turkish pacha ; and that for many years of his rule—nay, even to the last—the exercise of power, in a manner which we should deem arbitrary, was absolutely necessary to preserve either his own office or the independence of the nation. Much of his conduct was, however, highly reprehensible and decidedly tyrannical ; but we will not enter into a detail of his monopolies and other arbitrary proceedings. A charter was wrested from him by the opposition ; but neither the Turkish sultan nor the Christian emperors viewed it with any favour, and he was enabled to disregard it altogether. At length, however, his enemies gained the ear of the Porte, and in 1838 an *ustav* was issued from Constantinople, which greatly controlled the princely power, and enforced many wise regulations and excellent institutions. A senate was to be formed, consisting of twenty-one members ; seventeen of them, though appointed for life by the prince, were considered as severally representing the seventeen *nahias*, or districts, into which the country was divided. It was stipulated that they should be above thirty-five years of age, men of wealth and landed property, and general high standing, and should possess the confidence and good-will of the Servian people. The other four were ministers of state ; viz., the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of the home department, the minister of finance, and the minister of justice and public instruction, and possessed a seat in the senate, *ex officio*.

To this body belongs the whole legislative authority. They, too, alone can fix the mode of levying the existing imposts, or create new ones. Care is also taken to ensure the administration of justice, by the erection of duly organized courts of three degrees of authority. The judges, though appointed by the prince, cannot be displaced by him ; and no person holding a judicial office is allowed to exercise any military or political function.



We may here as well observe, that the criminal code now in force is founded on that of Austria, whilst the civil code is a localized modification of the code of Napoleon, first introduced by Milosch, and afterwards altered by his successors.

But to return once more to the thread of our narrative.

A forcible struggle now took place, which ended in the abdication of Milosch. His eldest son, who was dangerously ill at the time, soon after died, and his next son, Michael, succeeded to the throne. This prince appears to us to have endeavoured to improve the condition of the country; but the means which he and his ministers took to effect this were generally unpopular; and at length both the Turkish sultan and the Servian people united in deposing him. A general assembly of the nation was called, and Alexander Kara Georgevitch, son of the celebrated Kara Georg, was unanimously elected in his stead. The election was confirmed by the Porte; and, after some difficulty, Russia was prevailed upon to sanction this appointment. The firman, however, which acknowledges him as prince of Servia, confers the authority on him only for his life. And what may be the fate of Servia on his death it is impossible to say. In our opinion, an hereditary throne is essential to the well-being of a monarchy; and we earnestly trust that this great safeguard of order, freedom, and independence, may not long be denied to the Servian people. Both Ranke and Paton give a pleasing account of the present prince.

And now that we have brought down the history of Servia to the present day, we must conclude this paper by a few extracts on the manners and customs of this very interesting people, referring our readers for further information on these and all other subjects to the works themselves.

The following is the account given by Ranke of the ceremonies observed at Christmas:—

“ On Christmas eve, after the labours of the day are finished, the father of the family goes into the wood, and cuts down a straight oak sapling, which he brings into the house with the salutation, ‘ Good evening, and happy Christmas!’ To this all present answer, ‘ God grant it to thee, thou happy one, rich in honour!’ and cast corn over him. Then the tree, which is called *badujak*, is placed upon the coals. In the morning, which is saluted by the firing of pistols, a visitor appears, one being previously chosen for each house. From a glove he throws corn through the doorway, and exclaims, ‘ Christ is born!’ Some one in the house, in return, throws corn towards the visitor, and answers, ‘ In truth He is born!’ On this another of the party advances; and whilst with a poker he strikes the *badujak*, which is still lying on



the coals, so that the sparks are scattered about, he cries, 'As many sparks, so many oxen, cows, horses, goats, sheep, swine, bee-hives: so much good fortune and happiness!' The housewife then envelopes the visitor in a coverlet of the bed; and the remains of the badujak are carried into the orchard. They do not go to church, but every one comes to the repast with a lighted wax taper. Holding the tapers in their hands, they pray, and kiss one another, repeating the words, 'God's peace! Christ is in truth born! We adore Him!' To indicate a close union of every member of the house, the head of the family collects the yet burning tapers, and, fastening them together, places them in a dish filled with the tshesznitza and all sorts of grain, and thus extinguishes them. The tshesznitza is an unleavened roll of the usual form, with a piece of money kneaded into it; and when it is broken, he who finds the money in his piece of bread is expected to have, above all the others, a fortunate year. The table is not cleared, nor the room swept, during three days. Open house is kept for every comer until New Year's-day, the salutation continuing, 'Christ is born!' and the reply, 'In truth He is born!'"

We will not pause to recount the superstitions still existing in Servia, though Ranke's account of them is curious and interesting. A vampire at top and a witch at the bottom, with the dodola in the centre, and a dish of wilis on either side, form the principal objects, and to the lovers of the marvellous furnish an excellent banquet.

One notion, however, entertained by these mountaineers deserves especial mention, in that it is the poetical expression of a divine truth.

"The plague, too, is considered by the Servians, as it is also by the Lithuanians and modern Greeks, to be a personal being. Female forms with white veils are supposed to carry the disease from place to place, and from house to house; and many persons sick of the plague will protest most solemnly that they have seen them to their sorrow—ay, and have even conversed with them! These female forms are personifications of the plague. Their appearance, however, is not ascribed to their own evil will, to chance, or to any other malevolent influence: it is believed that God Himself, when wickedness has become too great to be longer permitted, sends them from a distant land."—p. 72.

Our own thoughts are irresistibly carried to the palaces and dungeons of ancient Egypt, and wander thence in humble awe to the threshing-floor of Araunah and the camp of Sennacherib.

The national ballads of Servia appear to be of a very high order. Ranke's account of them is peculiarly brilliant and felicitous. Is he a poet himself? We should imagine so from the power and beauty of this portion of his work. Some of the

poems are of a legendary character; others devotional; others describe scenes of nature and passages of life, the contest and the peace of the affections.

But let us now, for a while, consult the pages of our countryman. Mr. Paton's account of his visit to the convent of Tronosha, gives us a most pleasing impression of the Servian peasantry; indeed, kindness and reverential feeling meet us at every turn.

"Before going to Sokol, the natchalnik persuaded me to take a highland ramble into the Gutchevo range, and first visit Tronosha, a large convent, three hours off in the woods, which was to be on the following day the rendezvous of all the surrounding peasantry, in their holiday dresses, in order to celebrate the festival of the consecration.

"At the appointed hour our host appeared, having donned his best clothes, which were covered with gold embroidery. His sabre and pistols were no less rich and curious, and he mounted a horse worth at least sixty or seventy pounds sterling. Several other notables of Losnitza, similarly broided and accoutred, and mounted on caracoling horses, accompanied us. . . .

"Ascending rapidly, we were soon lost in the woods, catching only now and then a view of the golden plain through the dark green oaks and pines. For full three hours our brilliant little party dashed up hill and down dale, through the most majestic forests, delightful to the gaze, but unrelieved by a patch of cultivation, and miserably profitless to the commonwealth, till we came to a height covered with loose rocks and pasture. 'There is Tronosha,' said the natchalnik, pulling up, and pointing to a tapering white spire and slender column of blue smoke that rose from a *cul-de-sac*, formed by the opposite hills, which, like the woods we had traversed, wore such a shaggy and umbrageous drapery, that, with a slight transposition, I could exclaim, 'Si lupus essem, nollem alibi quam in *Servia* lupus esse!' A steep descent brought us to some meadows, on which cows were grazing, by the side of a rapid stream, and I felt the open space a relief after the gloom of the endless forest.

"Crossing the stream, we struck into the sylvan *cul-de-sac*, and arrived in a few minutes at an edifice with strong walls, towers, and posterns, that looked more like a secluded and fortified manor-house in the seventeenth century than a convent; for in more troubled times, such establishments, though tolerated by the old Turkish government, were often subject to the unwelcome visits of minor marauders. A monk . . . welcomed the natchalnik at the gate, and putting his hand on his left breast, said to me, '*Dobro doche Gospody!*' (Welcome, master!) We then, according to the custom of the country, went into the chapel, and, kneeling down, said our thanksgiving for safe arrival. I remarked, on taking a turn through the chapel, and examining it minutely, that the pictures were all in the old Byzantine style, crimson-faced saints looking up to golden skies. Crossing the court, I looked

about me, and perceived that the cloister was a gallery, with wooden beams supporting the roof, running round three sides of the building, the basement being built in stone, at one part of which, a hollowed tree shoved in an aperture formed a spout for a stream of clear cool water. The igoumen, or superior, received us at the foot of the wooden staircase which ascended to the gallery . . . . and, taking me by the hand, led me to a sort of seat of honour, placed in a prominent part of the gallery, which seemed to correspond with the *makaá* of Saracenic architecture. . . . . After coffee, sweetmeats, &c., we passed through the yard, and piercing the postern gate, unexpectedly came upon a most animated scene. A green glade that ran up to the foot of the hill, was covered with the preparations for the approaching festivities; wood was splitting, fires lighting, fifty or sixty sheep were spitted, pyramids of bread, dishes of all sorts and sizes, and jars of wine in wicker baskets, were mingled with throat-cut fowls, lying on the banks of the stream, side by side with pigs. Dinner was served in the refectory to about twenty individuals, including the monks and our party. The igoumen drank to the health of the prince, and then of Wucics and Petronievitch, declaring that thanks were due to God and those European powers who had brought about their return. . . . . Some old national songs were sung, and I asked my neighbour for a criticism on the poetry. 'That last song,' said he, 'is like a river that flows easily and naturally from one beautiful valley to another.' In the evening we went out, and the countless fires lighting up the lofty oaks had a most pleasing effect. The sheep were by this time cut up, and lying in fragments, around which the supper parties were seated cross-legged. Other peasants danced slowly, in a circle, to the drone of the somniferous Servian bagpipe. When I went to bed, the assembled peasantry were in the full tide of merriment, but without excess. . . . . I fell asleep, with a low confused murmur of droning bagpipes, jingling drinking cups, occasional laughter, and other noises. I dreamed I know not what absurdities; suddenly, a solemn swelling chorus of countless voices gently interrupted my slumbers, the room was filled with light, and the sun on high was beginning to begild an irregular parallelogram in the wainscot, when I started up, and hastily drew on some clothes. Going out to the *makaá*, I perceived yesterday's assembly of merry-making peasants quadrupled in number, and all dressed in their holiday costume, thickset on their knees down the avenue to the church, and following a noble old hymn. I sprang out of the postern, and, helping myself with the grasp of trunks of trees, and bared roots and bushes, clambered up one of the sides of the hollow, and attaining a clear space, looked down with wonder and pleasure on the singular scene. The whole pit of this theatre of verdure appeared covered with a carpet of white and crimson, for such were the prevailing colours of the rustic costumes. When I thought of the trackless solitude of the sylvan ridges round me, I seemed to witness one of the early communions of Christianity, in those ages when incense ascended to the Olympic deities in gorgeous temples, while praise to the true God rose from the haunts of the wolf, the lonely cavern, or the subterranean vault.

When church service was over, I examined the dresses more minutely: the upper tunic of the women was a species of surtout of undyed cloth, bordered with a design of red cloth of a finer description. The stockings, in colour and texture, resembled those of Persia, but were generally embroidered at the ankle with gold and silver thread. After the mid-day meal, we descended, accompanied by the monks. The lately crowded courtyard was empty and silent. 'What,' said I, 'all dispersed already?' The superior smiled, and said nothing. On going out of the gate, I paused in a state of slight emotion. The whole assembled peasantry were marshalled in two rows, and standing uncovered in solemn silence, so as to make a living avenue to the bridge. The igoumen then publicly expressed the pleasure my visit had given to the people, and in their name thanked me, and wished me a prosperous journey, repeating a phrase I had heard before: 'God be praised that Servia has at length seen the day when strangers come from afar to see and know the people!' I took off my fez, and said, 'Do you know, Father Igoumen, what has given me the most pleasure in the course of my visit?'

"*Igoumen.* 'I can scarcely guess.'

"*Author.* 'I have seen a large assembly of peasantry, and not a trace of poverty, vice, or misery; the best proof that both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities do their duty.'

"The igoumen, smiling with satisfaction, made a short speech to the people. I mounted my horse: the convent bells began to toll as I waved my hand to the assembly, and 'Sretnj poot' (a prosperous journey) burst from a thousand tongues. The scene was so moving, that I could scarcely refrain a tear."—pp. 130—139.

With the Servians, the idea of Christian fellowship is no futile fancy,—no curiosity or ornament, kept only for show; they welcome the Christian stranger as their friend and their brother. We earnestly trust that no misconduct of our countrymen will chill their feelings towards those who, both in a civil and religious point of view, are their nearest of kin amongst the nations of the West. We could wish that the matter were officially taken up by our Church, and measures taken, by sufficient authority, to ensure an intimate and enduring alliance between the English and Servian Catholics. Such a step would be beneficial to both parties, and to Christendom at large; nor should we lose sight of the important position which the Servian Church occupies, both geographically and spiritually, in reference to Rome.

Education is already rapidly advancing in Servia. A bishop, whom Mr. Paton met, thus expressed himself on the subject:—

"The civil and ecclesiastical authorities go hand in hand in the work. When I was a young man, a great proportion of the youth could neither read nor write. Thanks to our system of national education, in a few years the peasantry will all read. In the towns, the sons of those

inhabitants who are in easy circumstances are all learning German, history, and other branches, preparatory to the course of the gymnasium of Belgrade, which is the germ of a university."—p. 114.

We might certainly assist them in this matter.

The following circumstance strikingly illustrates the general desire existing throughout Servia for improvement and enlightenment; a desire which is indeed attested by many other passages in the work before us:—

"A booby, with idiocy marked on his countenance, was lounging about the door; and when our mid-day meal was done, I ordered the man to give him a glass of slivovitsa, as plum-brandy is called. He then came forward, trembling, as if about to receive sentence of death, and, taking off his greasy fez, said, 'I drink to the health of our prince, Kara Georgevich, and to the progress and enlightenment of the nation.' I looked with astonishment at the torn, wretched habiliments of this idiot swineherd. He was too stupid to entertain these sentiments himself; but this trifling circumstance was the feather which indicated how the wind blew."—p. 88.

The picture of Servian manners, given by Mr. Paton,—their hospitality, simplicity, and originality, is highly interesting. It could not be transferred to our pages without transcribing half the book. We cannot, however, help quoting the following conversation:—

"After the usual salutation, the natchalnik began, 'We have heard that gospody Wellington has received from the English nation an estate for his distinguished services.' *Author*—'That is true; but the presentation took place a great many years ago.' *Natch.*—'What is the age of gospody Wellington?' *Author*—'About seventy-five. He was born in 1769, the year in which Napoleon and Mohammed Ali first saw the light.' This seemed to interest the party. The roughly-clad trooper drew in his chair, and leaning his elbows on his knees, opened wide a pair of impudent eyes; the natchalnik, after a long puff of his pipe, said, with some magisterial decision, 'That was a moment when nature had her sleeves tucked up. I think our Kara Georg must also have been born about that time.'"—p. 107.

And now we must bid farewell to this subject. If it has interested our readers half so much as it has interested ourselves, they will not have spent a tedious hour in reading what we have written. If such be the case, we earnestly urge them to proceed further to exert that influence which they possess (and every one in this land does possess influence in a greater or less degree) in the cause of the rayah, in endeavouring to secure and increase the blessings of those who have already achieved a partial independence, and to confer the benefits of freedom and security on

those miserable millions who still groan beneath the unutterable horrors of Turkish slavery. It is the duty of Christian men not only to give alms of such things as they possess to their less wealthy brethren, but to rescue the weak from the hand of the strong, and tear the prey from the jaws of the wicked. Let us then all, as we are severally able, unite in this truly noble crusade—to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to break the yoke of the infidel, and to let the Christian go free. And if we labour truly in this good work, however quietly and humbly, we shall surely be rejoiced on the day of Judgment with the glad and glorious words, “Forasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto ME.”

---

ART. V.—*Tentativa Theologica. Episcopal Rights and Ultramontane Usurpations.* By Father ANTONIO PEREIRA DE FIGUEREDO, Priest and Doctor of Lisbon. Translated from the original Portuguese, with Notes, and some additional matter, by the Rev. E. H. LANDON, M.A., Author of "*A Manual of Councils.*" London: Joseph Masters, 33, Aldersgate-street.

2. *The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism, upon testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the First Six Centuries.* By THOMAS WILLIAM ALLIES, M.A., Rector of Launton, Oxon. London: Burns.

THE latter of the two works we have mentioned at the head of this paper, has been for more than a year before the public, and has attracted attention by the research which distinguishes its pages, and which has amassed a considerable body of proofs that the papal supremacy was unrecognized by the early Church. The author of this work has arrived at the very correct conclusion, that the whole controversy between the Roman Church on the one side, and the Eastern and Western on the other, turns upon the question whether the papal supremacy is of Divine right; *i. e.* whether it was an institution of the Divine Author of Christianity—whether it is an essential feature in the Christian Religion. If it be so—if the Pope be indeed the head of the Church by Christ's institution, the inference follows, that there can be ordinarily, no salvation out of his communion; that the Roman Catholic communion is *the* Catholic Church of Christ; that all who are separated from it are heretics or schismatics, or in a state of damnation. On the other hand, if the Pontiff of Rome is *not* by any Divine right the head of the Universal Church, it is evident, that those who are separated from the see of Rome and its communion, may, notwithstanding, be members of the Catholic Church of Christ; that such Christians are justified in resisting the claims of Rome to the supremacy which it has claimed for ages past—that the Roman communion cannot pretend to be the whole Catholic Church, without being in actual error; that its infallibility is at an end, since the attributes of the Universal



Church cannot belong to it. Thus every thing depends upon the doctrine of the papal supremacy; and we have reason to feel grateful for the labours of authors who have carefully examined this very important question.

Mr. Allies, in the work before us, is occupied entirely in the task of contrasting the present theory of the papal power, with the doctrines and the practice of the Universal Church for the first six centuries; and he has, with the aid of Bossuet, Du Pin, Tillemont, and other learned divines of the Roman communion, very satisfactorily shown, that during the first ages the Roman bishop, while acknowledged as in some sense the successor of Peter the Apostle (a rank, however, which was believed to be shared by every bishop); as the first bishop of the Universal Church; and as possessed of great weight and influence in all its affairs; was never held to be the source of all power or jurisdiction in the Church, or to possess the attribute of infallibility. On the contrary, it is shown, that the bishops are believed to derive their authority from Christ Himself and not from the pope; that they exercised supreme power and authority in all those matters which are now claimed as belonging by Divine institution to the papacy only; and that, in fine, they have repeatedly, in council, decided without, or in opposition to, the decrees or the judgment of the pope.

Such proofs as these are beneficial in themselves, and they have perhaps something of a peculiar force as coming from an author, who admits that recent occurrences have driven him to examine the records of antiquity, with a resolution to be guided practically by them in the choice of a religion. They are apparently wrung by the mere force of truth from one who had been very deeply under the influence of Mr. Newman, and who, in the work before us, cannot refrain from expressions in regard to his former leader, even after his secession from the Church of England, which, in another, might almost tempt us to doubt his own steadfastness. Nay, so far has the teaching of this master taken root in Mr. Allies' mind, that the language used throughout in reference to the English Church, is calculated to neutralize, in some degree, the effect of his main argument against the papal supremacy.

We must confess that we do not approve of the position which various writers, who call themselves churchmen, have thought it right and advisable to take up. We allude to that kind of dubious neutrality, that affected impartiality, which they assume in matters of controversy between the English Church and her opponents. We must most earnestly enter our protest against

such a course as inconsistent with Christian principle. It is the course of men who are, in fact, undecided in their convictions—of those who are “halting between two opinions.” If the English Church be a true branch of Christ’s Church on earth—if there is a positive *duty* in remaining in her communion—if truth is on her side—and if she is pressed on all hands by open and concealed enemies—then we say it is the most urgent duty, and the noblest privilege of her members, to maintain her cause firmly and unwaveringly, not bating one jot of her rights to any of her foes—not giving place by subjection even for an hour to those who seek her downfall—not holding parley with traitors to her cause. On the other hand, if the Church be untrue; if it be schismatical, heretical, full of abominations—let it be forsaken. But do not let us, while we are proving that the Church of England is not in schism, declare at the same moment, that it is in the most fearful state of corruption, and that it presents few of the attributes of a Christian Church. This is, we say, a defence so weak, and so undecided, that the effect on the mind must be, to leave the whole question as it found it. For this reason, we cannot think Mr. Allies’ work suitable for general reading. Its effect on the whole is uncertain.

We need not say that the appeal of Romanists to the history and traditions of the primitive Church, is made with the highest confidence and assurance. And undoubtedly the array of authorities produced is very imposing. It is so in more senses than one. We readily allow that the greater number of the Romish writers (even controversialists) who appeal to these authorities, have firm faith in their efficacy and their entire harmony with the Romish system. Charity obliges us to suppose that men will not generally speak so confidently on this subject as Romanists have done, without a conviction that they have real ground for their confidence; but at the same time it is beyond all doubt, that the vast masses of quotations from the Fathers, brought to establish the papal supremacy, are, in most cases, absolutely worthless; and we must therefore only suppose, that generation after generation in the Roman Church content themselves with the labours of a few eminent writers in former ages, and quote authorities at second-hand, without giving themselves the trouble to ascertain their accuracy or their value. In many cases, indeed, it is to be feared, that this conduct arises from that unscrupulousness in the use of means which so unhappily distinguishes the proceedings of the Roman Church; and history is extensively falsified, in the expectation, either that the reader will not have learning or patience to examine the mass of facts laid before him, or that, if

the discovery of its unfairness shocks the feelings of one reader, a thousand may be carried away by the apparent weight of authority.

It is for this reason that researches like those of the writers before us are valuable. They put in the way of the inquiring mind an antidote to the Romish argument for Christian antiquity, in behalf of the papal supremacy. Take the following instance from Mr. Allies:—

“Of a passage in this letter (one of St. Cyprian's) De Maistre says (*Du Pape*, liv. i. ch. 6), ‘Resuming the order of the most marked testimonies which present themselves on the general question, I find, first, St. Cyprian declares, in the middle of the third century, that heresies and schisms only existed in the Church, because all eyes were not turned towards the priest of God, towards the pontiff who judges *in the place of Jesus Christ*.’ A pretty strong testimony indeed, and one which would go far to convince me of the fact. Pity it is, that when one refers to the original, one finds that St. Cyprian is *actually speaking of himself, and of the consequences of any where setting up in a see a schismatical bishop against the true one*. After this, who will trust De Maistre's facts, without testing them? The truth is, he had taken the quotation at second hand, and never looked to see to whom it was applied. It suited the pope so admirably, that it must have been meant for him. But I recommend no one to change their faith upon the authority of quotations which they do not test.”—p. 29.

The Ultramontane theory of the papal power is unquestionably entitled to the praise of consistency and logical consecutiveness; and this, it is well known, has once more become the predominant doctrine in the Roman Catholic communion. Indeed, its advocates regard the opposite theory of the Gallican theologians as one which is erroneous and even heretical; and nothing can exceed the contempt and hatred with which they regard the anti-papal doctrines of these latter theologians. Even Protestants are less the objects of their abhorrence than these most dangerous foes to the Ultramontane theory.

The Ultramontane and the Gallican agree in maintaining that the papal supremacy was instituted by Jesus Christ Himself, and is a leading feature of Christianity; so that communion with Rome is essential to Christianity. But at this point a most serious divergence takes place,—the Ultramontane proceeds to draw the legitimate inferences which result, that the pope is infallible in all religious questions, and that his power is absolute, and without limits; so that not only the Universal Church dispersed, but the whole body of its bishops assembled in council are of inferior authority to that of the pope, and all bishops are merely his assistants and subjects. Now this theory is certainly

a plausible and consistent scheme. It establishes a centre of unity in the Church, which in exercising absolute control over all its proceedings, is at the same time exempted from the possibility of error itself. The whole of the vast and complex machinery of the Church is placed under the guidance of one mind, which is always infallibly right.

When so many learned and able theologians have taken such immense pains to accumulate proofs from Scripture and from Christian antiquity in support of this high and specious theory, it must certainly be peculiarly perplexing to its advocates to find eminent members of their own communion not merely denying the greater part of the practical results which unquestionably flow from the admission of the papal supremacy, but appealing to the language and actions of the early fathers, and of many of the most eminent divines of the Roman communion, in proof that the Ultramontane theory, in general, is wrong in principle and in spirit. The blow which such writers deal on the very key-stone of the Roman faith is not diminished in reality by the high-flown language in which they indulge on the subject of the papacy. It is a very poor consolation to an Ultramontane to find a Gallican writer descanting on the "dignity" of the "chair of Peter," and asserting its inviolable union with the Catholic Church; when he also hears him denying the infallibility of the pope, and his absolute authority over all Churches; and giving to councils and bishops the power of examining and revising his decrees, and even of differing from him, and excommunicating him, or remaining in their convictions and practices in spite of his excommunications. In short, the Gallican theory establishes the right of private judgment in the bishops as against the pope; and is thus, as the ultramontanes observe, not essentially different from that of the Protestants; while it at once justifies, in the abstract, the position of a national Church, like that of England, in holding its own reforms and discipline, in opposition to mere *papal* decrees and mandates.

In principle, this Gallican doctrine—we mean the doctrine of such writers in the Roman Catholic communion as Bossuet, Fleury, Thomassin, Du Pin, Gerson, and Pithou,—exempts the English Church from all imputation of schism or heresy, as far as obedience to the papacy is concerned in the question. And thus the great point which is made against us by the see of Rome itself, and its adherents in general, is refuted by their own co-religionists. On the other hand, Rome and its most zealous partizans tell us, that *general councils* derive all their authority from the pope,—that they are not infallible,—that consequently no one can be bound by their decisions,—that no power, except

the papal, is absolutely binding,—and therefore Rome itself consoles us by the assurance, that the Gallicans are in error in supposing that we must necessarily have ceased to be a part of the Catholic Church, because condemned by the mere council of Trent.

We see, of course, that both parties agree in condemning the Church of England, but then they do so on contradictory principles. The one party condemns us on grounds which the other dissents from quite as much as we do. And this utter and irreconcilable contradiction amongst Romanists as to the grounds on which they impute schism and heresy to all those who are not of their own communion, takes from their censure the force which it might otherwise possess. The members of the English Church, indeed, can see that their religious system is strongly condemned not merely by the Romanists, but by all the various classes of professing Christians around them, such as Socinians, Neologians, Dissenters, &c. But then these various opponents condemn us on contradictory grounds. For instance, one party objects to the episcopal system of Church government, while another adopts it: one party accuses us of heresy for denying the papal supremacy, and the doctrines of Romanism; the others reject these doctrines with violence, and charge us with popery. By the Romanists we are charged with holding the principles of dissent; by dissent we are identified with Romanism. The Unitarian and the Rationalist impute to us superstition and bigotry. The Romanist attempts to prove that our faith is mere private opinion, and the sport of our reason; that the theory of Protestantism is ours, and that it leads to infidelity. Painful as it must be to observe the doctrines which we hold thus violently assailed, and difficult as it may be for individuals to resist argumentatively the subtle and acute reasoning which is offered to them by the various opponents of their faith, or to detect its error or its fraud, there is a kind of safeguard in the contradictory accusations of sects and communions: these opposing forces preserve the mind in an equilibrium, for there is so much to be said by Neologians on the one side, Dissenters on the other, and Romanists on the third, that people who are unable to examine with care into religious questions are naturally led, in common prudence, to remain in the creed which they have been taught.

This opposition between sectarians generally in the grounds of their difference from the English Church, renders their protest ineffective. And the same difficulty at once presents itself in Romanism when considered by itself; Romanism cannot agree on the real grounds of its condemnation of England. If we ask of one party why England is schismatical, he will answer, "Because you

do not obey the pope :” another will answer, “ Because you do not obey general councils.” Is then the infallibility of the pope an article of faith ? we inquire. “ Yes,” reply Bellarmine and Rocaberti, De Maistre and La Mennais. “ No !” answer Milner, Trevern, Hornyhold, and Delahogue. “ It is absolute error and heresy ; for a council alone is infallible !” exclaim Bossuet, Du Pin, Gerson, and the Sorbonne. Well then, if the infallibility of the pope is actually a disputed point among Romanists—if it is not an article of faith—the necessary inference is, that this doctrine was not revealed by God, that it was not taught by our Lord, that it constitutes no part of the Gospel. And if so, the Church cannot be bound always to receive the dogmas of the pope and his adherents, because it cannot be bound to receive what may be possibly an error.

Such a doctrine as this goes very far towards the exculpation of churches against which it is alleged that they do not obey the papacy. And we are indebted to writers of the Roman communion for bringing very forcibly forward so salutary a doctrine. We allude to Bossuet, Du Pin, and the learned author of the first work whose title we have placed at the head of this article, Father ANTONIO PEREIRA DE FIGUEREDO, of Lisbon. It is in vain that such writers attempt to obviate the consequences of their principles, by asserting that the pope is the successor of St. Peter ; that communion with the Roman see is a sign of catholicity ; that the primacy is of Divine right ; that the Church must always remain inviolably united to the chair of Peter at Rome ; that error cannot invade the see of Rome, because it will never hold a different faith from that of the Catholic Church. These expressions, however full of devotion to the papacy, really are of no weight, because those who employ them have advanced *solid arguments and proofs in opposition to the papal infallibility, and absolute power* ; and therefore they *cannot* maintain that the papacy never will err, or that it never can be separated from the Church, or that all churches are absolutely bound to obey it, or that union with it is essential.

It was the acts of the Sovereign in England at the period of the Reformation which led to the emancipation of the English branch of the Western Church from the see of Rome. The Gallican Church was led from a similar cause, in the reign of Louis XIV., to assert its liberties, and to limit the rights of the papacy ; and the dispute was on the point of issuing in a complete rejection of the papal jurisdiction. A century afterwards, in Portugal, a similar contest between the imperial power and the see of Rome, very nearly rendered the Church of Portugal independent of the papacy ; and it was in the course of this dispute that Pereira wrote the able work which we have alluded to.



Antonio Pereira, as we learn from the introduction to this volume, (written by an editor who has evidently expended some labour in the task,) was born in 1725 at Maçao, in Estremadura, and was educated in a Jesuit college, from which he passed into the order of the Oratory. His earlier literary labours were chiefly on grammatical subjects and on rhetoric; but in 1762, and the following years, he published some works on the Œcumenical Councils, which at once established his character as a theological historian of the highest erudition and power, the ablest that Portugal possessed.

In consequence of differences which had arisen between the Pope and Joseph, king of Portugal, the latter, in 1760, forbade his subjects, under heavy penalties, to hold any communication with the See of Rome. After three or four years had elapsed, serious inconveniences began to be felt; for intercourse with Rome being prevented, it was impossible to obtain the usual dispensations from thence for the celebration of marriages between persons within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity, which in the Roman Church have been extended by the popes to a very great degree. The discontent became very great, and it was evidently necessary to provide some remedy at once, unless the court was prepared to concede the demands of the See of Rome in the matter then in question.

In this difficulty, the king and his minister, the Marquis de Pombal, applied to Pereira, who was known to entertain strong opinions in opposition to ultramontanism; and he undertook the commission of writing a work to prove that every diocesan bishop had, in all cases where it was impossible to have recourse to Rome, the full and canonical right of granting dispensations. The work, when completed, excited the alarm of the court theologians and royal licensers, who dreaded the boldness of its views; but they did not venture to prohibit its publication, and it made its appearance in 1766, to the infinite wrath and alarm of the Jesuits and all partizans of the Roman See. It was condemned by the Pope, and was publicly burnt at Rome; but in Portugal and throughout Roman Catholic Europe it was received with universal applause, and it was translated into several languages, and, doubtless, lent additional energy to the efforts of those in all parts of Europe who desired to shake off the yoke of Rome. In 1773 he resumed his labours in the same cause, and published his *Demonstração Theologica*, in which he proved the right of metropolitans to confirm their suffragans elect, even where there is no kind of impediment preventing them from having recourse to Rome.

Having premised this brief statement of the labours of Pereira,  
VOL. VIII.—NO. XV.—SEPT. 1847.



we must proceed to examine the contents of the important volume now before us, for the translation of which we are indebted to the Rev. E. H. Landon, M.A., the author of a useful "Manual of Councils."

The work is dedicated to the archbishops and bishops of Portugal and its dominions, whom the author addresses in the following terms:—

"Christ our Lord is the immediate author of the episcopate, because it was He who immediately ordained his apostles bishops, when He said to them, 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you: receive ye the Holy Ghost: go ye into all the world; preach, teach, baptize: whatsoever ye shall bind or loose, shall be bound or loosed in heaven.' Words which, from their very fulness and indefiniteness, denote a power without limits: without limits as to *matter*, since its measure was the necessity of the people; without limits as to *place*, since, in virtue of these words of Christ, each apostle had no less a field than the whole world given to him for his diocese."—p. 2.

In proof of this statement, Pereira quotes two eminent theologians of the Roman communion:—

"First, Cardinal Cusa, bishop of Brescia, book ii. chap. 13, *De Concordia Catholica*: 'We say truly, that *all the apostles were equal to Peter in power*: moreover, it must be remembered, that in the beginning of the Church there was but one general episcopate.' The second is Dominic Soto, the immortal glory of the illustrious order of the Dominicans, who distinguished himself at the Council of Trent, in the time of Paul III. He writes thus: 'Since jurisdiction, in both kinds, is in its fullest sense *essentially* part of the apostolic office, all [the apostles] received both kinds immediately from Christ, and so every one of them was made by Christ a bishop of the whole world.'"—p. 2.

After some further quotations, establishing the authority of bishops, and their succession to the power of the apostles, Pereira proceeds thus:—

"It is true, that in course of time the successors of St. Peter appropriated to themselves the exercise of certain jurisdictions which had previously been possessed by the bishops. But, besides that, these first reservations all belonged to causes *in foro contentioso*, and, strictly speaking, were in accordance with the exterior policy of the whole Church; they were not appropriated by the Roman pontiffs *without the consent of the other bishops*, who, out of complaisance and veneration for St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, *alienated from themselves, in favour of the pope*, his successor, those prerogatives which were originally common to all dioceses. Of this we find an excellent example (which I have also given in the body of the work) in the acts of the Council of Sardica, celebrated in the middle of the fourth cen-

ture. The following are the words of the celebrated Hosius, bishop of Cordova, the president: 'Si vobis placet, Sancti Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus, ut scribatur ab his qui causam examinarunt Julio Romano Pontifici, et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium, renovetur et det iudices;' and then immediately it is added, 'Respondit synodus, Placet.' We have here the fathers of a large council confessing, that, in honour and memory of the apostle St. Peter, the first bishop of Rome, they had all resolved and agreed that the Roman pontiff should *henceforward enjoy the privilege of being allowed* to grant a new trial, or revision of their sentence, to bishops condemned in the provincial synod, not by bringing the cause into the Roman courts, as is now done in conformity with the chapter, *Causæ Criminales*, of the Council of Trent, but by naming new judges to examine afresh the cause of the appellant bishops in their province."—pp. 3, 4.

The position then, maintained by such writers as this, is, that every bishop is invested with full apostolical power in his own diocese, and that, whatever acts of jurisdiction are exercised by the pope in the dioceses of other bishops, are founded merely on the concessions or grants of bishops and councils. And from this principle it results that such powers may be *resumed* by those who granted them, whenever it is necessary so to do. There is, in fact, an inherent power in all bishops to withdraw, in urgent cases, the privileges which have been granted to the papacy in former times, because each bishop is invested by Jesus Christ with full apostolic power.

We must present here a summary of the argument by which Pereira establishes the truth of his first principle,—“That the episcopal jurisdiction, considered in itself, that is, in its institution by Christ, and apart from any law, use, or reservation to the contrary, is a jurisdiction absolute and unlimited in respect of each diocese.”

The words of our Lord, Matt. xxviii. 18, establish the absolute power of the apostles:—“All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” And his language in St. John's Gospel, xx. 21, is equally strong: “As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.” It is clear from these passages that the apostles were thus constituted ministers of the New Testament, shepherds of the Church, and administrators of the sacraments: and this power of administering the sacraments includes not only the power of order,

but that of *jurisdiction*, the power of consecrating the eucharist, absolving, administering all the rites of the Church, choice and mission of new ministers, power of enacting laws on such subjects, and of dispensing with them in case of necessity, or for the advantage of the faithful. St. Paul explains the office of a bishop to consist in *ruling* and *governing* the Church of God. "Take heed to yourselves and to the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops to rule the Church of God;" and the power of legislation, and of dispensing with laws, cannot be separated from the power of governing.

Accordingly, there are abundant proofs in Scripture, that each apostle acted on these powers in his own province, as chief pastor of the flock committed to him: and the power which they respectively exercised was absolute and unlimited, extending to all kinds of cases. Our Lord's words imply a power without limit or restriction: "All power is given unto me; go ye therefore and teach all nations." "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you." We know that each and all of them, in their several provinces or dioceses, ordained many bishops, and gave to them the power of ordaining others. Thus St. John ordained Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna; St. Paul, in Crete, ordained Titus, with power to erect new bishoprics in the island. And if the apostles, in virtue of the Divine institution, thus exercised the exalted power of ordaining bishops (the greatest power in the ecclesiastical hierarchy), it is evident that there are no cases which were not subject to their authority.

And now, when we come to inquire who succeeded to this power and jurisdiction of the apostles, the ancient fathers agree that it was the *bishops*. Pereira refers, in proof, to St. Firmilian, of Cappadocia, in the 75th epistle to St. Cyprian; to St. Cyprian himself, in his epistles to Cornelius; to St. Pacianus, of Barcelona, epistle 1; to St. Jerome, in his epistles to Evagrius, and to Marcella. Firmilian speaks in these terms: "The power of remitting sins was therefore given to the apostles, and to the Churches which they, being sent by Christ, founded, and to the bishops who, *being ordained into their places, succeeded them*." And the language of St. Augustine, on the 44th Psalm, is very striking; "Instead of the apostles, bishops were constituted. Think not, therefore, that thou art deserted (he is speaking of the Church), because thou seest not Peter, because thou seest not Paul, because thou seest not those through whom thou hast been born; thy ancestry hath grown up to thee from among thy offspring."

The argument proceeds thus at this point:—

"From this I draw two most important conclusions. First, that the

*jurisdiction* of bishops is derived to them, not from the pope, but immediately from Christ Himself, which is proved from this, that what our Lord said to St. Peter, viz., 'Thou art Peter,' &c., and 'Feed my sheep,' &c., He also said to the other apostles; viz., 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.' 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations,' &c. Therefore as it *may* be drawn from the first texts, [Pereira, as we shall see, elsewhere shows that a different interpretation may be put on them,] that the successor of St. Peter is by Divine right primate of the Church, and hath received immediately from Christ the government and administration of the Universal Church, so from the other it *must be concluded*, that the successors of the apostles are also by Divine right the pastors and governors of their respective dioceses, and receive immediately from Christ the power of governing and administering them. This is the doctrine held by the sacred faculty of Paris from time immemorial, and indeed for twelve centuries by the whole Catholic Church, till at last ignorance, or a contempt for antiquity (as Bossuet observes), introduced the contrary doctrine into the schools, viz., that the jurisdiction of bishops is derived immediately from the pope; a doctrine which, when we know that it was unheard of until the thirteenth century, we are sure of its falsehood; whilst the contrary is securely and plainly founded upon Holy Scripture and tradition."—pp. 34, 35.

We have not space to follow the writer in his proof of the truth of this conclusion, which he fortifies by reference to Scripture, and to the doctrine and practice of the Universal Church. We pass to the second inference which he draws from the above principles:—

"The second conclusion is, that the power thus given by Christ to the bishops, is *of itself a power absolute and without limit*, for the government of each diocese. This appears from the same principles. For as Christ, in saying to St. Peter, 'Thou art Peter,' and again, 'Feed my sheep,' constituted the successors of St. Peter, viz., the Roman pontiffs, pastors of the Universal Church, saving always the rights of the bishops; so also when He said to the apostles, 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you,' He constituted the successors of the apostles, viz., the bishops, pastors of each particular Church, saving, in like manner, the primacy of the pope, which consists in nothing more than in the administration and oversight of the whole Catholic Church, in order that such minister, according to his place in her hierarchy, may do his duty and exercise his functions perfectly according to the rule laid down by the Divine Law, and the canons established with the common consent and acceptation of the whole Church. For the papal and episcopal authorities are both of the same order, and belong to the same kind, differing only in this respect, that the pope is to the whole Church what the metropolitan is to his province, saving always the rights of the suffragans. Thus St. Thomas, 'The sacerdotal power is surpassed by

the episcopal power, as by a power of a different kind, but the episcopal power is surpassed by the papal, as by a power of the same kind. Hence every hierarchical act which the pope is able to perform, a bishop can perform likewise<sup>1</sup>. Which is the same with what Cardinal Cusa has more briefly expressed in the second book, 'De Concordantia Cathedralica', chap. xiii. 'The only peculiarity in St. Peter was, that he was superior in administration.' And again in chap. vii., 'The superiority of the archbishop, primate, and pope, consists in administration.'—pp. 36, 37.

Pereira proceeds to show, especially from the writings of Cyprian, the supreme and absolute power of bishops in their own dioceses. He refers to the declaration of this father, that it has been established by the Divine Law, "that the Church should be built upon the bishops, and that every act of the Church should be governed by the same rulers;" that "every head possesses the free exercise of his will in the administration of his Church, subject to the account which he must hereafter render of his deeds to the Lord." Reference is made to the doctrine of Cyprian, who maintained that after certain bishops (Fortunatus and Felicissimus) had been judged and condemned in a provincial synod of Africa, they had no right to appeal to Rome, and the pope had no right to restore them to their sees, because the bishops in synod were supreme judges of all causes in their province; and to hold that the jurisdiction of Africa, *within the province, was inferior to that of Rome*, "could be asserted only by lost and desperate men."

The words of Cyprian also in reference to St. Peter and the other apostles are of the highest importance. "The other apostles were what Peter was, enjoying the like fellowship of honour and power: but the beginning springs from unity, [and the primacy is given to Peter<sup>2</sup>,] that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one." Pereira remarks here, "that Cyprian speaking not only of the power of *order*, but also and principally of the power of *jurisdiction*, is apparent from the context which shows that "in the episcopate is contained *all the power left by Christ in the Church*." This position is further established by abundant proofs from the fathers, the councils, and from modern theologians of the Roman communion, such as Thomassin, Petrus Aurelius, De Marca, &c. And the practice of the first eight centuries is adduced to show that the bishops, during that long course of time, always acted as supreme judges of faith, and as being possessed of plenary and independent jurisdiction and authority by the institution of Jesus Christ.

<sup>1</sup> S. Thomas, t. vii. p. 2, fol. 145. Ed. Rom. 1570.

<sup>2</sup> Cusa, de Conc. Cath. ii. cap. 3 & 17.

<sup>3</sup> This passage is interpolated, and forms no part of the original.

This is a very important line of argument to the defence of the independence of Churches against the claims of the papacy. Its advocates maintain, that the pope alone is supreme and absolute, and that all bishops derive their jurisdiction from him. They hold that his jurisdiction extends over all parts of the Church, that it is, in every diocese, immeasurably superior to that of the bishop. Hence, if the pontiff enacts laws and regulations on any subject—if he reserves to the disposal of the papacy the privileges which have been hitherto enjoyed by bishops, they are bound to yield a prompt obedience. His jurisdiction being absolute, while theirs is limited by his will, and derived from his grant, it is of course impossible for them to resist without sin; and it is equally impossible for them to resume what has been once conceded, if the will of the sovereign pontiff be to retain it. This principle, then, provides for the unlimited increase of the pontifical power; it establishes as a matter of Divine right that the papal power never can lose any thing which it has once obtained, and that it may obtain whatever it desires in future. So that in fact the Church must be the “slave” of the papacy, as Cardinal Cajetan described it. But this all depends on the concession, that episcopal jurisdiction is derived from the papal, that it is not of Divine but of human origin, that the bishops are bound to be obedient to the papal laws, without any power of disobeying them. If these doctrines are denied, the whole fabric of the papal power falls at once. The pope becomes merely superior in honour and influence to other bishops; he cannot have *jurisdiction* except by voluntary concession—by human institution, over any bishop; and what has been made, may be unmade again; what has been conceded for good reasons, may be withdrawn for good reasons.

This precisely was the principle on which the reformation in England proceeded, in its abolition of the papal supremacy. The question was put before the prelates, the convocation, monasteries, and universities in the kingdom, whether the pope has, by *Divine institution*, any jurisdiction in England. This was exactly the point in debate. The opponents of the Reformation, the advocates of the papacy, maintained then, as they do now, that by *Divine institution* the pontiff had jurisdiction over the whole Church, and every diocese of it. It was on this principle that they founded the whole of the papal power. When the principle was rejected, the papacy fell along with it. The moment that its jurisdiction was recognized as a mere human institution, it was possible and desirable to remove it. No council had established it; the Universal Church had never ordained it. It had risen by its own usurpations, or by the connivance of the temporal powers, and the



adulation of some of the bishops. And having thus no solid basis of right to rest upon, it perished in England.

To maintain that the apostles were equal in power—that the bishops were the successors of the apostles—that they did not borrow their jurisdiction from Rome—that they were supreme in their dioceses—is to *shut out* the pope from every diocese of the Universal Church except his own, *as a ruler*. This is what the Reformation has done, following the examples and the doctrines of the fathers and the primitive Church; and this is precisely the doctrine which such writers as Bossuet, Petrus Aurelius, Du Pin, Fleury, Thomassin, and Pereira, in the Roman communion, have so ably established. It may indeed seem that this is not a fair representation of the results of the teaching of these divines, because they all admit the primacy of the see of Peter at Rome, and derive it from the passages of Holy Scripture usually relied on by Romanists to prove the institution of the papacy, such as, “Thou art Peter,” &c., “Feed my sheep,” &c. But when these writers come to examine such texts, and to meet the arguments which Ultramontanes derive from them, they utterly subvert the whole scriptural argument for the papacy. Take the following passage as an instance, in which the authority conferred in the texts alluded to above, is attributed to the *universal Church*, instead of to *St. Peter*.

“To return to our principal subject. No man has better explained the *subordination of the pope to the Church*, than the great St. Augustine, who teaches at every step, that Christ gave all spiritual power to the *Church*, as the subject principally intended by Him, whether He spoke to St. Peter, or to the other apostles. In the book *De Agone Christiano*, cap. xxx.: ‘Not without reason does Peter, amongst all the apostles, sustain the character of this Catholic Church. For to this *Church* are the keys of the kingdom of heaven given when they are given to Peter; and when it is said to him, ‘Lovest thou me?’ ‘Feed my sheep,’ it is said to all<sup>4</sup>.’ And further on, ‘The *Church*, which is founded upon Christ, received from Him the keys of the kingdom in Peter, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins<sup>5</sup>.’ See the 295th sermon (which is the 108th in the old editions, *de diversis*, no. 2). ‘He was not the only one amongst the disciples entitled to feed the Lord’s sheep, but when Christ speaks to *one*, unity is commended; and first of all to Peter, because Peter is the first of the apostles<sup>6</sup>.’ And in another place, ‘Peter alone merited to represent the whole Church. Because he alone represented the person of the whole Church, he merited to hear, ‘Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ For *these keys not one man, but the unity of the Church received*<sup>7</sup>.’”

<sup>4</sup> S. August. tom. vi. p. 260.

<sup>6</sup> S. Aug. Serm. 295, cap. 4, tom. v. p. 1195.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. tom. vi. p. 822.

<sup>7</sup> Pereira, pp. 140, 141.



This is a little specimen of the kind of proof which is producible from Christian antiquity in opposition to the interpretation of these texts by Romanists. Pereira refers to St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, St. Leo I., Venerable Bede, and others quoted by Launoy, book ii. Ep. 5; by Simon Vigor in his *Treatise de Monarchia*; Louis Du Pin in *Dissert. vi. § 1*; and by Natalis Alexander, in the history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, *Dissert. viii. 53*.

Gerson, in later times, contends, that "to this Universal Church *alone* is the power of binding and loosing given." "Augustine, with many others, says, that the keys of the Church *were* *not given to one*, but to *unity*, and that they were given to the Church." Cardinal Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope Pius II., said, in his history of the Council of Basle, in reference to St. Augustine's position of the promise to St. Peter, "By which words the very foundation of our wranglers is shaken and altogether destroyed, since if Peter bore the person of the Church, we ought to ascribe the power of those words not to Peter but to the Church." Antonio de Melis, again, a counsellor of Pope Eugenius IV., says, "Christ appears to have founded the Church, *not upon Peter alone*, but *on all the apostles*, according to the words of the Psalmist, 'The foundations are upon the holy hills.' . . . Although He founded it upon Peter as upon *one*, significatively and *figuratively*, was founded nevertheless upon all the apostles, *substantially*, *principally*, and *effectively*, according to that of Augustine upon John, 'When Peter received the keys, he signified the whole Church'."

There are abundance of similar testimonies in proof that the powers conferred by our Lord, in his declarations to Peter, were conferred on Peter merely as representing the Church; that they are given to the Church, and to Peter, as one of its members, not to Peter alone or principally. The Council of Pisa, Cardinal Francis Zabarella, Alfonso Tostado Bishop of Avila, Andrew of Escobar Bishop of Megara, the University of Cracow, Cardinal Nicholas de Cusa, the Fathers of the Council of Basle, &c., are amongst the authorities which may be cited in refutation of the papal claims founded on these texts<sup>1</sup>.

In fact, then, the argument for the papacy is entirely subverted by these eminent theologians of the Roman communion. They must prove that the episcopal jurisdiction in each diocese is supreme and absolute by the institution of Jesus Christ; and they prove this solidly from Scripture, and the consent and practice of the whole of Christian antiquity. Thus the papal power is en-

<sup>1</sup> Pereira, pp. 142, 143.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 143

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp. 144—147.

tirely *shut out*. The papacy at once becomes a jurisdiction which has no right to interfere with the dioceses of *other bishops*: it is limited to the diocese of Rome as a *jurisdiction*. The pope may urge other bishops to obey the canons, but he has no absolute *power* over them. *They* may urge *him* to obey the canons also; and they may reject his decrees and laws, if they are erroneous or unjust. This principle then restricts the Roman primacy (which they admit and loudly maintain to be of Divine right) within very narrow bounds: it ceases to be a primacy of jurisdiction, and becomes one of influence, honour, and dignity. But as the promises of our Lord to St. Peter certainly import some real privileges, these writers maintain that whatever *power* was given by our Lord to that apostle was intended solely for the *Church*—*not merely for St. Peter himself*: so that the very foundations of the primacy of the see of Rome are subverted; and it is difficult to see on what grounds these writers can maintain any peculiar prerogative in that see as arising from Divine institution. If our Lord gave the keys in reality to the *Church*, in the person of Peter,—if He commanded all bishops, as much as Peter, to feed his sheep, then Peter had no power which was not given to the others equally; and, therefore, supposing the pope to be peculiarly the successor of Peter, he can have no power beyond the successors of the other apostles<sup>1</sup>.

Now, undoubtedly, these principles are fatal to the see of Rome; and it is perfectly natural that the more consistent and thorough-going adherents of the papacy should be disposed to repudiate all such maxims. If the principles of such writers as Pereira are quoted to them, they obviate the difficulty by at once rejecting them as heretics, or unsound teachers, whose principles cannot be recognized as consistent with the teaching of the Catholic Church. But this mode of obviating the difficulty is one which cannot be resorted to in all cases. Even if one or two writers amongst those adduced may be set aside as of little weight in the opinion of an ultramontane, what is he to say to such writers as Augustine, Cyprian, Jerome, Leo, Venerable Bede, Gerson, Pius II., Antonio de Rosellis, Zabarella, Tostado,

<sup>1</sup> These writers endeavour to preserve some foundation for the primacy of the see of Rome, by observing, that although all the apostles equally received the keys from our Lord, and had equal power with Peter, yet the keys being given to the Church in his person, conferred a superior honour on this apostle; and they also refer to his subsequent actions in the Church as a proof of his weight and influence amongst the apostles. They then *assume* that the Roman pontiff succeeded to the rank of St. Peter, though there is no evidence from Scripture that the dignity of St. Peter was intended to be hereditary; and it is a disputed point amongst Romanists whether the bishop of Rome is *de jure divino* the successor of Peter! If Scripture be referred to, as proving the primacy of Peter, it ought surely to be referred to for proof of the transmission of that primacy to *others*.

Escobar, Cusa, Launoy, Bossuet, Fleury, Thomassin! These were writers who lived and died in communion with the see of Rome,—men of the highest renown amongst the fathers, and amongst the Roman theologians. Du Pin, Van Espen, De Hontheim, Tamburini, and Pereira, have done nothing more than repeat or apply the doctrines which such writers have advanced before them. Bossuet as effectually subverts the foundations of the papal supremacy, in his “Defence of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy,” in 1681, as Luther himself, though he still admits that doctrine.

We most fully concede to the Ultramontanes (that is, to the great body of the Roman communion at the present day), that the Gallicans, and those who have maintained their principles, are altogether inconsistent in acknowledging the papal primacy as they did. We admit that they held doctrines absolutely subversive of that which is usually considered to be the very essence of the Roman Catholic faith. Presbyterianism is less vitally opposed to the doctrine of episcopacy than Ultramontanism to Gallicanism, because the question of infallibility is involved in the latter controversy and not in the former. But erroneous as the Gallican doctrines may be in the eyes of so many modern advocates of the Church of Rome, dangerous and pernicious as they may deem such doctrines, still they cannot be *set aside*, as if they had never existed, or never been allowed by the Roman Catholic Church.

The Gallican doctrines are, beyond all possibility of denial, *recognized* doctrines in the Roman communion. They have been publicly avowed by numbers of their most eminent theologians, *without condemnation*; and by faculties of theology, universities, bishops, and whole churches. It is true that the writings of such men as De Hontheim and Pereira have been censured *by the pope*; but to suppose that such censure could be binding on the Roman communion generally, would be to assume the question in debate amongst its adherents. These writings have accordingly continued to be circulated in the Church of Rome to the present day.

Ultramontanes cannot deny that the Gallican doctrines have, for many ages, been held by leading divines of the Roman communion. Let the adherents of the see of Rome in general deny, as much as they please, the authority of Du Pin or De Hontheim, still the *fact* is evident, after all, that the interpretation of the texts of Scripture, usually cited in support of St. Peter's supremacy, has always been a matter of *dispute* in the Church of Rome itself; and, consequently, the meaning which is attached

to them by the advocates of the papacy is a mere private interpretation,—a point of *opinion*. They will not pretend that what has been openly *disputed* for ages in the Church of Rome is an article of faith, or a point of necessary belief. If it were, where would be the infallibility of the Roman Church, or its unity in articles of faith? The result is, then, that Romanists make the whole of Christianity turn on interpretations and doctrines which are only matters of opinion in their own Church. The Eastern and Western Churches are denounced as heretical or schismatical; the greater part of Christendom is excluded from salvation; the Sacrament is mutilated; image-worship, the worship of creatures (forbidden by Scripture), and numberless other corruptions, are pertinaciously defended; faith is supposed only to exist in the Roman Catholic communion: and all this depends, at last, on an *opinion*,—a doctrine and an interpretation which is disputed even by Roman Catholics!

There is scarcely a Romish book of controversy which does not labour to prove that Protestants have no faith, because they rest their belief, not on an infallible tribunal, but on private *opinions*. May not the argument be retorted on Romanists themselves? They, at least, admit its force, or are *bound* to do so; therefore, they may be called on to show how *they* can pretend to have any faith at all, when they rest its foundation on mere matter of opinion.

Any one who is acquainted, even in the smallest degree, with the principles of the ancient Church, or with those of Holy Scripture, must be shocked at the extravagant and blasphemous extent to which the adulation of the papacy has been carried by many of its adherents. Take the following from the gloss upon the canon law:—"In any thing that he [the pope] wishes, his will is instead of reason, nor is there any who can say to him, Why dost thou this? For he is able to dispense beyond law, to make injustice justice, by correcting and altering laws." Cardinal Torquemada declares, that "of all ecclesiastical jurisdictions, the pontificate alone has Christ for its immediate author; so that the power and jurisdiction of the sacred apostles proceeded from Peter. That the ecclesiastical hierarchy (which mainly consists in the bishops and parish priests) is not of necessity in the Church, by any institution of Christ, but is only voluntary and dependent upon the will of the pope, who consequently may change and alter it as he pleases." And, again, De Palude affirms, that "the bishops and other clergy, below the pope, are nothing more than the pope's deputies in the Church; and accordingly, as his deputies merely, he may remove them from

their offices when and how he pleases, without any fault on their part." Cardinal Cajetan styled the Church "the born slave of the Roman pontiff".

But the worst is yet to come. There have been Romanists who have gone to the length of giving to the pope the name of God. Nor perhaps need we wonder much at this, seeing that they have no scruple in speaking of the Virgin Mary as a deity. But the matter-of-fact is well worthy of remark.

Pereira attributes to flattery "the title of God given to the pope, by the author of the comment on the extravagant of John XXII., beginning *Cum inter nonnullos*, who, upon the word *declaramus*, at the end of the extravagant, says thus: 'To believe our Lord God the Pope, maker of the said decretal.' So is in two editions, published at Lyons in 1584 and 1606, and those of Paris, published in 1585, 1601, 1612'."

We must extract the note on this passage from Pereira's appendix, which is important:—

"1. It is undeniable and certain, that the gloss upon the extravagant referred to does give the title of God to the pope, as may be seen by any persons who will refer to the editions quoted in the *Tentativa*. It is quite as certain that the popes have never *refused* or *rejected* this title; for the passage in the gloss referred to appears in the edition of the Canon Law, published at Rome in 1580, by Gregory XIII., and the Index Expurgatorius of Pius V., which orders the erasure of other passages, yet leaves this one.

"2. I will now examine into the pernicious consequences which flow from this flattery. In a letter written by Pope Nicholas I. to the Emperor Michael, he testifies that the Emperor Constantine gave to the Roman pontiff the absolute title of God; and from that he infers that secular princes have no power whatever over the popes. 'Satis videnter ostenditur, à sæculari potestate nec ligari prorsus, nec solvi posse Pontificem, quem constat à pio Principe Constantino DEUM appellatum, nec posse DEUM ab hominibus judicari manifestum est.' . . .

"Upon the authority of this real or pretended saying, however, the pope declared that it was the duty of the faithful to call the pope God, and so it is commanded in the *Decretum* of Gratianus, cap. *Satis*. Dist. 6; and the Roman theologians have accordingly made no scruple of treating it a proper and inseparable attribute of the supreme pontiff. The following are examples:—

"(1) Cura, ut salutem quam dedisti nobis et vitam et spiritum non mittamus. Tu enim pastor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, tu cultor, et denique ALTER DEUS in terris.'

"Christopher Marcellus, archbishop of Corfu, speaking to Julius II.,

<sup>1</sup> Pereira, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> Credere Dominum Deum nostrum Papam conditorem dictæ Decretalis.

<sup>3</sup> Pereira, p. 130.

in an oration, held before the fifth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1512, in the fourth session.

“ ‘ (2) DIVINÆ MAJESTATIS tuæ conspectus, rutilante cujus fulgore imbecilles oculi caligant.’ ”

“ Antonio Pucci, in an oration before the same council, in the tenth session.

“ ‘ (3) Antigraphum ad Clerici Gallicani de ecclesiasticâ potestate Declamationem, Optimo, Maximo, Summoque Pontifici, Christi Vicario, Innocentio XI., Urbis et Orbis Domino, Cœlorum, Terrarum, Inferorumque Janitori unico, Fideique Oraculo infallibili, humiliter dicit consecrat præsentat Nicholaus Cevoli,’ &c.

“ Dedication of a work, written against the declaration of the clergy of France, by an author of noble blood.

“ ‘ (4) Potestatem Pontificis esse infinitam, eo quod ‘ magnus Dominus, et magna virtus ejus, et magnitudinis ejus non est finis!’ ”

“ Fr. Augustine de Ancona, who flourished in the beginning of the fourteenth century, in his Summa.

“ ‘ (5) Sicut nullus potest appellare ad seipsum, ita nullus potest appellare à Papa ad DEUM, quia una sententia et una Curia est DEI et Papæ.’ ”

“ The same\*.”

Of course, we are assured that such expressions as these are to be taken, not in their strict and apparent meaning, but in a secondary and inferior sense. Those who employ this language would, we suppose, have expressed indignation at the imputation of idolatry. They would have protested that they worshipped only one Supreme God, and that the pope was merely called God in an inferior sense,—that he could not be worshipped or honoured in the same way as God or Jesus Christ. It is amazing to see the facility with which Romanists, in general, can obviate all difficulties of this nature by referring to their professed belief in one God, as if this theoretical belief enabled them with perfect safety to give to creatures the honour due to the Creator. There is nothing to surprise any well-informed person in the use of such expressions with regard to the pope. Those who are aware of the worship of saints and angels, practised in the Romish communion, without the slightest blame from any of its authorities, cannot wonder at the appellation of DEITY being given to the pope. When the Virgin Mary and the saints are directly addressed in prayer, and all blessings and graces, both temporal and spiritual, are sought from them, as well as from God; when hope and confidence is placed in them, and they are even acknowledged as deities; it is, of course, quite consistent with such practices and principles to admit the pope to be an inferior God.

\* Pereira, p. 180.



There is one palpable inconvenience in all these distinctions, which the Romanists ingeniously draw with a view to excuse such things from the guilt of idolatry. It would excuse any idolatrous worship which might acknowledge the supremacy of one God (such as that of the Hindoos, for instance,) from the guilt of idolatry. It would allow any number of creatures to be worshipped by Christians, provided their worship was less in degree than that which is offered to the Trinity. In fact, it would amount to this—that Christians or Jews, as long as they acknowledged all other beings to be inferior to God, could not be guilty of idolatry. Platonism would be at once excused in its worship of the heathen deities; and Arianism, which was accused of heathenism by the fathers for its worship of Jesus Christ as a second and inferior God, would be perfectly protected.

In truth, Romanists, on this as well as on many other points, prove too much. If their defence involves the defence of idolatry generally, it is evident that their position is really untenable.

When the popes themselves have become the objects of this idolatry, without manifesting any signs of reluctance, or attempting to protest against it and repress it, we cannot expect that they should endeavour to reform the idolatrous practices which are common in their communion. They always lend their support to such practices, while they discourage, and even strongly condemn those who censure them. To protest against the idolatrous worship of the Virgin and the saints, is regarded as a symptom of heresy, and excites the indignation of the leaders of Romanism.

There is one thought irresistibly pressed upon us by these facts. There are undoubtedly some within our own communion who are not sound in their faith—some who do not adhere to the doctrines of the Church of which they are professedly members—some persons of turbulent and seditious dispositions. In short, it is easier to see, than it is at all times safe to depict in a broad and striking way, the errors which are in the minds of some who are bound to act differently. But, whatever may be the mistakes or the faults among some of our members, they are surely not equal to the plague of idolatry which has eaten so deeply into the Roman Church. And lamentable as it is to see divisions in the Church, and angry feeling arising from these divisions and parties, yet surely it were better to witness such a struggle between truth and error, than the unchecked predominance of idolatry as in the Church of Rome—a stealthy idolatry, which, with a profession of orthodox faith, proceeds to sap the foundations of Christianity.

But to return to the work now before us. Pereira lays down the following principle, which is of great importance, and is

---



capable of inferences and an extension which he does not connect with it. The principle is as follows:—

“When the bishops consented to the reservations made to the pope (if indeed they ever did consent, at least to all), it was upon condition that when recourse to Rome was in any way hindered, the jurisdiction and power which they had so surrendered should for the time return to them.”—p. 182.

This principle is very cautiously worded. It merely claims the right of a *temporary* resumption in *urgent cases* of the episcopal jurisdiction, which has been superseded by the papal. But the arguments on which this right is founded go to a far greater length, and justify in other cases than that immediately contemplated by Pereira, the resumption of jurisdiction which has been allowed to devolve on Rome.

The groundwork of the whole is that doctrine which is held by all Gallicans, that bishops are the successors of the apostles—that their jurisdiction is derived from Jesus Christ—that they are supreme in their respective dioceses. Hence it follows, that whatever general *jurisdiction* in the dioceses of other bishops has been acquired by the Bishop of Rome, has been the result of concessions on the part of the bishops—so that, in fact, the papal jurisdiction emanates from the episcopal, and not the episcopal from the papal, as the Ultramontanes contend. Hence it is inferred, that, in cases of urgency, the bishops and their synods may *resume* the exercise of jurisdiction on all those matters, which are now customarily reserved to the see of Rome. They *have* the power by Christ's institution, but they have *consented* to its being exercised by the pope. Therefore, if they see reason to withdraw their consent for a time, they can do so.

Pereira sustains his principle by authorities of considerable weight; amongst which are the writings of Cyprian, Augustin, Chrysostom, Pope Celestine, Gerson; and the examples of Athanasius, Eusebius of Samosata, and the clergy of the Gallican Church.

“The object,” he says, “for which the bishops gave up to the apostolical see the powers and privileges of which they were possessed, could be no other than *the good of the Universal Church and of each of their dioceses*, which found in the supreme pontiff a ready and wise assistant in all their necessities. When, therefore, recourse to Rome cannot be had [the writer might have added—or having recourse to Rome becomes no longer conducive to the benefit of the Universal Church or of particular Churches,] this object ceases, and with it, the reservation to which the bishops consented. For this reason, that the office of a bishop is, *jure Divino*, the office of a pastor,” &c.—p. 182.

From such principles as this writer has laid down, Gerson advances considerably beyond the position of a mere *temporary* resumption of jurisdiction of the bishops. He maintains, that *however ancient* may be the exercise of power by the Roman pontiffs in matters of jurisdiction reserved to them, and thus removed from the jurisdiction of the bishops to which they originally belonged, not one of those reservations can have authority or force, when they are inconsistent with the welfare of the Church or of particular dioceses; and that consequently bishops have a right to oppose them when harm would result from their continuance.—“Let the prelates of the Church,” he says, “arise and offer to God the sacrifice of righteousness, and let them think it good utterly to put away these rapines, thefts, and robberies of the Romish court [he so names the reservations], for they cannot stand or be prescribed to the injury of the whole Church, since they are contrary to the proper nature of the mystical body, and contrary to all justice,” &c.<sup>1</sup>

The authorities and examples quoted by Pereira in the second part of his work are also of the highest importance, as bearing on the same point, and they raise one or two questions which affect materially the question of the papal supremacy in general, and its grounds.

We shall notice a few of these authorities and precedents, all of which are derived from the Latin or Western Church subsequently to its separation from the Eastern Church, and during ages at which the power of the popes had attained its highest elevation.

Occam, a friar minor, who lived in the 14th century, maintains, that when no actual recourse to Rome can be had, in case of war, or from some other cause, several provinces of the Church might unite in appointing a primate, whose office should continue at least until intercourse with Rome could be renewed. Thus, according to this writer, the power of jurisdiction remains in the Church, even without any actual intercourse with Rome; or rather, in case such intercourse is prevented, the jurisdiction *reverts* to the bishops<sup>2</sup>.

Peter de Marca, archbishop of Paris in the seventeenth century, observes, that “it cannot be dissembled, that the administration of the Church which was obtained *jure divino* by the bishops, was not taken from them by any [papal] decretals, although the manner of exercising that power was variously pre-

<sup>1</sup> Exurgant Prælati Ecclesiæ offerentes Deo Sacrificium justitiæ, et has rapinas, furta, et latrocinia Romanæ Curis dignentur penitus amovere; quia non possunt in detrimentum universalis Ecclesiæ stare aut præscribi, cum sint contra naturam propriam corporis mystici, et contra omnem ordinem justitiæ, &c.—Gerson, tom. ii. p. 184.

<sup>2</sup> Pereira, p. 225.

scribed by various constitutions, according to the circumstances of the times. Therefore, if such times should occur as that *the necessity of governing the Church should compel the bishops* to depart from the more modern regulations, nothing hinders that the Divine and natural law should take place, those forms which the new law has prescribed being omitted. For example, if there be a vacancy in the papal chair for many years, if the approaches to the city be in the hands of an enemy so that the pontiff cannot be visited with safety, or if any other similar and serious chances should occur, the Church should be administered by this Divine law, or by that old ecclesiastical law<sup>0</sup>. The doctrine here inculcated is, that cases may be supposed, in which the bishops may resume all their original jurisdiction, and the papal jurisdiction over the Church generally be wholly superseded. Barthelina, a modern German canonist, observes, that in all cases of remoteness, and other difficulties, bishops have used their power in granting dispensations which had been reserved by custom to the pontiff; that they need have no scruple in doing so, if there be a canonical reason for doing so. Gerbais, a doctor of the University of Paris, (17th century,) also maintained that in urgent cases the bishops have power to grant dispensations in cases reserved by custom to the pope; and in reply to the objection that such an act would be an usurpation, he replies, "that when the jurisdiction is ordinary, [i. e. exists by established right,] it cannot become effete on account of its not having been exercised<sup>1</sup>."

But the language of Edmund Richer, syndic and doctor of the University of Paris, goes still further, and reminds us of the sentiments of Gerson, above referred to.

"Seeing, therefore, that the bishops derive their authority immediately from God, like the pope himself, and that he has nothing superior to them, by Divine right, except the first place in the priesthood and ministerial power, certainly the bishops *cannot be deprived by any human law of that power which they have, by Divine right, from God*. And if, at any time, they have assented to this deprivation, through violence offered to them, or through error, this assent is null by the rule, '*Qui errat non consentit*,' and that sacred things, divinely constituted, are not, like things temporal, owing to the length of time, to go by prescription to the usurpers. *Therefore the bishops may, as often as they will, be restored to their entire power*, if we look to the question of right; and of violence and the actual fact we are not disputing<sup>2</sup>."

The language of Richer is here forcible, and of wider range than that of De Marca and Bossuet, and others to be quoted; but the doctrine is substantially identical throughout—that it is lawful

<sup>0</sup> Pereira, p. 226.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 227.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 228.

under certain circumstances to suspend the papal jurisdiction, or to act as if it did not exist, and to resume in particular churches, *without the consent of the pope, and without any consent of a general council*, the original jurisdiction of the episcopal body.

This, of course, is a complete answer to the objection so commonly advanced against the English Reformation as schismatical or abolishing the jurisdiction of the pope. The bishops had, it is true, tacitly consented to invest the papacy with a certain jurisdiction, but they had done so in the exercise of power, conferred on them by Jesus Christ; they had done so for the benefit of the Church; and when their successors were convinced that it would be for the benefit of the Church to withdraw that jurisdiction which the pope derived from their consent only, they had the Divine right to resume their powers.

An objection was made to this doctrine by Mr. Froude, which has been repeated by opponents of the Church of England, that if a province is justified in withdrawing from the jurisdiction of the pope, particular bishops must be equally justified in withdrawing from the jurisdiction of their metropolitan. But there is a great difference in the cases. We are supposing the case of provinces like those of England and Ireland, which have never been placed under the jurisdiction of Rome *by any canon of the Universal Church*—provinces which have been in the course of ages accreted upon by the see of Rome, and at length acquired by mere tacit consent and submission. On the other hand, the jurisdiction of metropolitans over their provinces is one which is founded on distinct laws of the Universal Church. So that there is a foundation of right in the one case which does not exist in the other. There has been an usurpation in the one case; there has been none in the other. In the one case, the bishops throughout the world have solemnly enacted a jurisdiction for the sake of general utility; in the other, they have made no regulation, but have merely permitted a custom. We should say, therefore, that for any bishops of a province to withdraw from the metropolitan, and elect another metropolitan, *without consent of a provincial synod*, would be an unjustifiable disregard of laws which all bishops are bound to respect; but this does not apply in the case of the papacy.

The next quotations and examples in the work before us have reference to the particular case of a schism in the papacy, on which we propose to offer a few remarks.

Pereira quotes the treatise of Gerson, *de modo se habendi temporis schismatis*, to show that in a case where a Church remains neutral between rival claimants of the papacy, matters of jurisdiction devolve to the bishops. Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, also, in reference to such a case, says, "Where obedience is with-

draw from the surrounding world, what else remains than that the Church be managed in the mean time by episcopal government until the supreme pontiff be created? Thomas Aquinas observes that "during the schism of Avignon, when some nations withdrew from all obedience to any of the supreme pontiffs as in a sacred interregnum, the bishops seem to have resumed that full power of dispensing which they possessed originally." — *l. c.*

In 1374 the bishops and doctors of the Gallican Church assembled at Paris by order of the king, to devise some means for extinguishing the schism which had for twenty years, divided the Western Church. Twenty-two bishops and archbishops were present, as well as great numbers of abbots, canonists, and theologians: and they agreed by a great majority, to withdraw obedience from both pretenders to the papacy, and resolved that the bishops of the kingdom should exercise all branches of jurisdiction hitherto held by the pope, whilst there should be no undoubted pope. This resolution was adopted by France, England, Sicily, Jerusalem, Navarre, Bavaria, Genoa, Flanders, and the College of Cardinals.

From this time accordingly the bishops granted dispensations, confirmed elections, &c., as the popes had previously done. In 1408, the national synod of the Gallican Church made further regulations as to the course to be adopted in this state of neutrality, and transferred, amongst other things, the power of granting dispensations to the bishops and provincial synods, and the power of confirming episcopal elections to the archbishops, and of confirming archiepiscopal elections to the primate, or the provincial synod. From this time, the metropolitans of France resumed the right of confirming the elections of their suffragans.

In 1398, all the bishops of Spain assembled at Alcala, resolved to withdraw from the obedience of both pontiffs, and to restore all the jurisdiction possessed by the popes to the archbishops and bishops of Spain<sup>1</sup>.

These well-known facts suggest to a thoughtful mind the inquiry, how it is possible that the Ultramontane theory of the Church can be reconciled with actual facts. After giving to that theory the credit of consistency *in itself*, we have said all that can be conceded in its favour. On the other side, there is the certain fact, that the whole theory is disputed in the Church of Rome itself: it is, after all, only a matter of opinion, and not of faith in the Roman communion; and when it is compared with historical facts, the difficulty becomes insurmountable. Here is a

<sup>1</sup> Perelra, pp. 229—233.

power in the Church, which its advocates contend to be *essential* to the Church; so that whoever is separated from it, is a heretic and a rebel. Here is a power, which is, according to them, of *Divine institution*, established in the Church to be the sole bond of Catholic union; a power from which alone all jurisdiction in the Church is derived; which is *the* appointed tribunal for the decision of all controversies, and which, being removed, there could be no firmness of faith, no order of any kind in the Church. It is, in short, in this view, the animating principle of the whole Church. To be separated from it, is at once a proof of schism or heresy: nothing further is requisite.

If, then, the papacy be thus *essential* to the Church, it is not possible that such schisms can take place in the papacy itself as will separate the Church into two parties. Indeed, the notion of a *divided Church*, or of different parts of the Church being not in communion with each other through their earthly head, is one which is not admitted as possible by a Roman Catholic at the present day. According to the Romish theory of these latter times, the Catholic Church is always and immutably united in its communion and discipline, as well as its doctrine. There is, and there must *always* be, in his opinion, an infallible tribunal in this united Church for the decision of whatever controversies may arise, and that tribunal is the papacy. Therefore, the papacy cannot be interrupted. To suppose that it could be interrupted for a long series of years, or that it could even be uncertain which of two contending competitors was the true pope, could not be admitted by Romanists generally; for if they could allow that, at any period of the Church's history, there might be *no* pope for a long series of years, or at least no pope whose claims were clear and unquestionable, the Gallicans might immediately rejoin, that in such case the infallible tribunal for the decision of controversies must rest somewhere else; and the mere Protestant may infer that such an admission goes far towards subverting the notion of any infallible tribunal for the decision of controversies.

If the intervention of a general council be necessary sometimes, as De Maistre admits, in order to determine infallibly who is the successor of Peter, then infallibility is vested in the general council; and thus the Gallican cause triumphs over the Ultramontane; for if the general council is infallible, a pope must be bound to submit to it; it must be superior to a pope.

If, too, the Ultramontane were to admit an actual or virtual interruption for many years in the papal see as possible, his theory of union and intercourse with the successor of St. Peter, as the very essence of catholic unity, would be subverted. For how could the see of Rome be always the centre of unity, if it was



liable for a long series of years to be vacant? If it may be virtually vacant for twenty or forty years, it may be vacant for fifty or a hundred years. How is it to be the centre of unity, when it is liable to lengthened interruptions?

Thus, then, the Romanist of the present day *cannot* concede it as possible that the papal see has ever been really or apparently vacant for a long series of years, or that the claims of contending competitors can ever be so equally balanced as that the Church can (properly speaking) be divided between them. This latter point would be, indeed, altogether inconsistent with the notion of the *necessity* of union with the see of Rome.

The result then is, that when a Romanist of the present day contemplates the schism which disturbed the papacy and the Western Church in the fourteenth century, he can only conclude that one of the competitors was really pope, and the other a schismatic; that the one had distinct and evident proofs of his being really the head of the Church, while the other was as plainly and evidently an impostor. So that the state of the case was simply this: one of the rival popes in the great schism must have been the genuine successor of St. Peter, and all who were not in communion with him were schismatics, and cut off from the Catholic Church. The claims of the real pope must have possessed a far higher evidence than his competitor, as it is not to be supposed that Providence could ever leave the "successor of St. Peter" without ample signs of his authority. Therefore, there could not be any excuse for those who either obeyed a rival, or who withdrew from the papal authority.

This, then, being the case, it presents a view of the Catholic Church which is evidently at variance with the doctrine of the Romish Church, and, indeed, of the Church universal. It supposes, in opposition to the idea of a really universal Church, that the Church of Christ was at that time restricted within a small portion of Europe; for the greater part of the Western Church was not subject to the dominion of *either* of the anti-popes. Benedict had his adherents, but those who had withdrawn from his obedience, and those who obeyed his rival, were far more numerous; and the same may be said of his opponent. So that the true pope, whoever he was, did not hold communion with any *universal* Church; and the universality of the Church must have been interrupted, or else the succession in the papacy was interrupted. Here are rather serious difficulties in the way of the plausible theory of the papal supremacy and infallibility. We admit that nothing can be more striking than the notion of a supreme pontiff, possessed of oracular powers; able to terminate every controversy in the Church; the fountain of all episcopal jurisdiction; virtually the



sole bishop of the Church ; of whom all other bishops are mere delegates and deputies ; and to whom all the world is bound to submit implicitly. But then, this magnificent theory breaks down, when it comes in contact with the principles of the most eminent and learned Roman Catholic divines ; with the language and practice of the primitive Church ; and with the simple facts of history. The great western schism is a fact which either subverts the papal supremacy, or the universality of the Church, if it be viewed on Ultramontane principles.

We have above supposed that no Romanist in the present day will allow that, during the great western schism, there was no real and legitimate pope. We have assumed this as the natural result of those Ultramontane principles which are now in the ascendant. They will, of course, generally maintain that one of the rival popes was the successor of St. Peter, and that the others were schismatics. But let us suppose, on the other hand, with certain writers amongst the Romanists, that the case was one of so much *doubt* and *difficulty*, that it was impossible to determine who was the real successor of St. Peter ; and, therefore, that those who were willing to obey the pope, whenever his pretensions to the papal chair could be made out, were not really schismatics, although they were not actually in communion with the supposed centre of Catholic unity. What is the result in this case ? In the first place, such persons are compelled to admit that the papacy is liable to be either actually vacant, or else disputed by contending claimants, without any clear right, for twenty, thirty, or forty years at a time. If so, the unity of the Church must assuredly depend on something else than the existence of a supreme pontiff in the Church : the see of Rome cannot be the centre of Catholic unity. In the next place, if the two or three sections of the Latin Church who adhered to rival pontiffs, or refused obedience to either, were, notwithstanding their divisions, still parts and portions of one Universal Church, that Church must be one in such a sense as not to exclude serious divisions, and even separations of communion.

To hear a Romanist argue with a Protestant in the present day, one might suppose that the Roman communion had always been a model of unanimity and harmony. Hence we find him quoting such passages from Holy Scripture as, "A kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and a house divided against a house falleth." Perfect unity in doctrine, communion, discipline, is insisted on as an essential feature of Christianity. The notions of those who imagine that the Church of Christ may at times be divided,—that even a separation of communion may take place between different branches of the Universal Church,

are pronounced absurd, and contradictory to the very notion of unity. And yet the very persons who speak with so much confidence and decision, in rejecting the notion of more than the Roman communion being included in the Universal Church, must either admit that a similar separation of communion has frequently existed in the Roman Church itself—that this Church has, at times, presented a scene as far removed as possible from the theoretical unity which is represented as its invariable characteristic—or else they must allow that the Church is sometimes not universal. The great western schism was one of the most remarkable instances of this failure of unity, or catholicity; and there can be little doubt that the spectacle then presented exercised a powerful influence in preparing the way for the removal of the papal power at the Reformation. When theologians, and sovereigns, and prelates, had before them the recent examples of the Church existing, without any certain and undoubted papal authority, for half a century together,—when they had seen Churches providing for their own spiritual wants for many years, without any recourse to Rome, they must have been prepared for the removal of the papal jurisdiction at any future time, and the resumption of the episcopal authority.

In fact, although the Reformation startled the advocates of Romish theology from their slumbers, and put them upon vindicating the papal authority as its principal article, the sovereigns of Europe, of the Romish party, still exercised the power of abolishing the papal authority in their dominions, whenever they deemed it necessary to maintain their own interests or their dignity. Thus, to refer to a few examples mentioned in the work before us,—

“In the beginning of August, A.D. 1760, his majesty [Joseph I. King of Portugal] by his royal decree ordered, under heavy penalties, that no one of his subjects should hold any intercourse with the court of Rome, *either in spiritual or temporal matters*. This is the usual method by which the sovereign majesty of Catholic princes (without offence to religion or the primacy of St. Peter) has been accustomed to resent the injuries and slights of the Roman court. To say nothing of other and more ancient examples, King Louis XI. of France dealt thus with Pope Sixtus IV. in 1478; Louis XII. with Pope Julius II. in 1510; Henry II. with Pope Julius III. in 1551; and Henry IV. with Pope Clement VIII. in 1591. So in Spain the Emperor Charles V. in 1526 treated in like manner Pope Clement VII., and his son King Philip II. Pope Paul IV. in 1556; also Philip V. Pope Clement XI. in 1709. In Portugal, moreover, King John V. had recourse to the same measures against Pope Benedict XIII. in 1728 ‘.”

Thus all actual intercourse in temporal and spiritual matters with the see of Rome has been frequently arrested by the command of temporal princes of the Roman communion; and yet Churches have continued to exist in this state of separation from Rome; and in almost all such cases the bishops and clergy have acquiesced in the regulations of their respective governments. So that these are, in their degree, a proof of the persuasion of such members of the Roman communion, that there are cases in which the jurisdiction of the see of Rome may be justly removed—and consequently that it cannot be of Divine institution—for were it of Divine institution, no imagined expediency could justify its suppression, or excuse any Christians in submitting to the laws of any temporal ruler for even its *temporary* suspension.

Such facts as these go far to show that Roman Catholics have been perpetually at variance with the principles which they lay down in argument with the supporters of the Reformation, or of the Eastern Church,—that they cannot reconcile the history of their own communion with those principles.

If the Catholic Church can never be divided, then the true Church was not Catholic in the schisms of the fourteenth century. If it can be divided, the Eastern and Western Churches now divided from Rome may be parts of the Church universal, and Rome may be only a part, or even *no* part of the Church.

The notion of a *divided* Church is one which presents no real contradiction when it is fairly considered. To take the case of the Church of Corinth in the time of St. Paul, there is no difficulty in perceiving that it was *a Church*,—that it was one, and not many churches,—although it was divided by schisms. St. Paul addresses it as “*the Church* of God which is at Corinth;” thus recognizing its *unity* in a certain sense; and yet this unity was disturbed by divisions and contentions. “And this I say, that every one of you saith I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided?” Thus schisms and divisions in a particular Church do not prevent it from being a Church,—not a united Church indeed, but still *a Church*. We can understand the case of a Church in which dissensions have proceeded to such an extent as that even a separation of communion has taken place. Such was the case in the time of Clement, bishop of Rome, whose epistle is addressed ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παροικίᾳ Κόρινθον: and yet in this *Church* of Corinth the legitimate presbyters had been deprived of their office by a party of the people; but, notwithstanding this separation of the people from their pastors, these Corinthians were still *the Church* of Corinth. It is conceivable that cases may occur in a particular Church, in which a separation of com-

munion may take place, and parties may hold each other to be schismatics or heretics, and yet they may be mistaken in their judgment, and the blame or the mistake may be so divided between them, that neither can be pronounced faultless, and neither of them can be absolutely condemned.

What may be conceived as possible in a particular Church, may be also conceived as possible in the Universal Church. The Universal Church may be still one, though it is not united. This is a distinction of which Romanists take no account. They give to the Nicene Creed a force and an extension which the Creed itself does not warrant. "I believe one, holy, Catholic Church," is by them extended into "I believe one, *united*, holy, Catholic Church." So the Donatist explained the "holiness" of the Church to consist in the *absolute* and *perfect* sanctity of all its members. But these are exaggerations and perversions of the meaning of the Creed. The Church may be one, though it is not united; even as it may be holy in a certain sense, though it may be full of sinners. If there may be parties and separations in a particular Church, there may be also parties and separations in the Universal Church. The being of the Universal Church is no more at an end by such separations than the being of a particular Church. A family which is at variance, however extreme, is still one family, though not a united family. It does not become more than *one* family by all its dissensions. A nation, notwithstanding lengthened civil wars, still remains a nation. Nay it may remain so, though divided into several kingdoms. Thus Italians form one nation, though subject to many independent princes. And Germans also are a nation, though nationally divided. So also Christians, even when divided in some respects, may still remain Christians; i. e. they may be so in essential points,—in their *origin or birth* by baptism, in what is absolutely necessary to the continuance of the Christian character. Their dissensions may prove them to be in many respects imperfect and carnal (1 Cor. iii.), and yet this may be fully consistent with their continuance as members of Christ's body,—their faith may not wholly fail.

Of course we do not mean to say that all separations or divisions are consistent with the being of the Church, so that the Church, according to the latitudinarian theory, consists of a congeries of all sects and heresies holding every imaginable contradiction in doctrine and discipline. This would simply amount to saying that Christianity is a mere name, and that in point of fact there is no standard of faith whatever,—that Christianity is whatever we choose to make it. What we have been suggesting is only this,—that there is no absurdity or contradiction in the

notion of a Church, whether particular or universal, being in a state of division. We fully admit that all divisions in the Church are contrary to the Divine will and commandment, and that if they exist, they prove that there is much to blame and condemn on one side, or perhaps both; in their temper at least, if not in their cause. If there be divisions in the Church, it should be the hope of Christians that they may be healed by the influence of Divine grace: but it should be felt, that divisions of long continuance are not easily healed by ordinary men,—that Providence having permitted division in the Church to become extensive and lengthened, Christians must submit in patience to that which they have not caused, while, at the same time, they must endeavour to maintain the faith which has been delivered to them from the beginning.

That there is such a sin as schism we most firmly believe, and we would not for a moment hesitate in accepting all that has been said by the ancient Fathers and the most eminent writers of the modern English Church on this most important subject. With them we should not hesitate to condemn separation of individuals from a particular church, and of particular churches from the Universal Church, or even from other particular churches. Every division in the body of Christ is contrary to the will and commandment of its Divine Head. It proves that the Spirit of Christ is not guiding and directing such contending members. The language of Scripture is plain and unequivocal on the subject. But while this principle is to be decidedly maintained by all persons who have any title to the appellation of sound and intelligent believers; it would be an error to maintain that the absolute and perfect *unity*, so consistent with the commands and the will of God, must, in point of fact, *always exist*. Perfect sanctity of life in all professing Christians is the *will* of God; but yet it is rarely found in practice. To affirm that because charity and brotherly love, and the absence of all schisms, parties, and divisions, are enjoined by the Gospel, they will therefore infallibly be found at all times in all members of *the true Church*, that the true Church will never be divided, or distracted by jealousies, dissensions, parties, this, we say, is, *in effect*, to arrive at the same conclusion as the Donatists did, and to say that the Church consists only of perfectly holy persons.

The Romanist will readily allow, that divisions and differences to any extent may exist in the Universal Church, provided that the external communion with its supposed earthly Head and a portion of its body be preserved; but this, after all, is to admit, that the *will* of God as regards the union of Christians is not always realized; that his commandments are not always obeyed; that the

Church, notwithstanding these imperfections, and faults, and sins, does not fail. If, then, this be the case, there is nothing incredible in the notion, which has been supported by the whole history of the Church, that the Catholic Church has often been, and now is, not united, but divided. When it was *united*, its union and its universality afforded a powerful argument in the hands of Augustine and Optatus against the Donatists who pretended that Christianity was limited to their communion. But this argument was, after all, not a point of faith. That the Church was, and would be *universal*, the Fathers held; that the Donatists refused communion with the united Universal Church, was a matter of fact. But that the Church *never could be divided*, was an assertion which was not made by either party. Their assertion was, that there was, in fact, no division, that their opponents were separated from the true Church. On the whole, it must be observed, that the mere *arguments* of the ancient Christian writers are not to be pressed, as if they were infallible under all circumstances. If, for instance, the test of communion with all the Churches *founded by the apostles*, is a test of orthodoxy, as some of the Fathers made it, the Eastern and the Western Church alike have for ages been cut off from Christianity. The arguments of Augustine and Optatus against the Donatists ceased to be available whenever the Eastern and Western Churches were separated from communion. They could not have been employed in the time of the schisms in the West itself, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

- ART. VI.—1. *Preachers, Pastors, and Bishops ; or, An increased Ministerial Agency needed for the British Wesleyan Church.* By BENJAMIN LOVE, author of “*Records of Wesleyan Life.*” London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co.**
- 2. *More Bishops, more Priests, more Deacons. How to increase the Efficiency of the Church. A Sermon preached in the Church of St. Peter, Leeds, at the Visitation of the Venerable the Arch-deacon of Craven, June 17th, 1847.* By JAMES AKROYD BEAUMONT, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's, Leeds. Leeds : Harrison. London : Rivingtons.**
- 3. *A Letter to Lord John Russell on Bishops.* London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co.**
- 4. *A Letter on two present Needs of the Church, viz., Increase and Education of the Clergy. Reprinted from Letters in the Guardian.* London : Burns.**
- 5. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P., on some Circumstances injurious to the Usefulness of the Established Church.* By HENRY STEBBING, D.D., F.R.S. London : A. Hall and Co.**

THE great importance of the subject of Church extension will plead our excuse for drawing the attention of our readers to the present state of a question in which the temporal and spiritual welfare of the people of this country are deeply involved. We have for some time ceased to hear any thing of the question of Church extension in parliament ; and we see no reason to think that the interests of the Church have benefited by this silence. There may indeed be little hope of a successful issue in applications to parliament for grants in aid of the Church ; but still it seems desirable to claim at least the right of receiving especial aid and support from the State. It seems advisable also that some channel should be afforded for the popular expression of opinions favourable to the Church ; and, above all, it is of importance that the Church herself should not forget the dreadful amount of spiritual destitution which the last half century has created. It has been computed that several thousands of additional clergy are requisite, in order to enable the Church to grapple effectually



with the frightful mass of ignorance and irreligion by which we are surrounded. Yet there has been as yet nothing effectual done towards overtaking the annual increase of religious destitution.

It behoves the Church surely to consider whether it is not possible to devise some means for bringing out the necessary funds for Church extension. At present the agencies in operation are wholly insufficient. The funds borrowed from Queen Anne's Bounty by the Church commissioners are exhausted. The income derived from the suppressed canonries has been, we believe, to a great extent forestalled; and the endowment of new churches by the commissioners has become a matter of rare occurrence. The Pastoral-Aid Society, and the Additional Curates' Fund, appear to maintain with difficulty the incomes which they have hitherto raised; and their progress is extremely slow. It would seem that at present there are, comparatively speaking, no means for evangelizing the population of our manufacturing districts, and that they must be either consigned to total neglect or handed over to the proselytism of Romanists and Dissenters.

But this surely ought not to be. If any religious body in the land possesses the means of preaching the Gospel, it is the Church; and yet we grieve to say the Church does not at present make efforts in this cause commensurate with her responsibilities and her powers of doing good. Would there be any difficulty in raising 100,000*l.* per annum for the cause of Church extension, if there were a right feeling on the subject in our congregations? We firmly believe there would not. The offertory was proposed a few years since as an effective means for raising the necessary funds for Church extension; but the attempt, it is needless to say, was a total failure. It was introduced under circumstances indeed which rendered it an almost hopeless experiment; for being commenced merely by individual clergy, and those in general suspected of a leaning towards Tractarian theology, or even Romanism, it excited jealousy; and being not a general measure of *the Church*, it was entirely at the option of her members to accept it or not. The measure, in short, having become a bone of contention in the Church, is evidently one which is unsuitable to the present circumstances of the Church. Had it been introduced under the sanction of authority, i. e., by the recommendation of the episcopal body, and with the aid of an act of parliament, the result would, we believe, have been entirely different. But the time has passed by for this; and therefore the Church ought to look to some other means of providing for her wants.

Notwithstanding the unpleasant differences which have been connected with the attempt to revive the offertory for religious

purposes, still we cannot for a moment entertain the thought that there is any indisposition on the part of members of the Church to aid in the cause of Church extension, if it be put before them in an unexceptionable shape. If it assumes any thing of a party character it will, of course, fail. But if it can be conducted without reference to party, and come sanctioned by proper authority, we do not think that it can fail.

The offertory, then, must be considered as out of the question under the present circumstances of the Church; but we have never heard any objection raised to the system of collecting under the Queen's letters, except indeed to the *objects* for which those collections are sometimes raised, or the hands in which they have occasionally been placed. For instance, we believe that the collections on behalf of the fires at Quebec and St. John's, Newfoundland, and for the benefit of the starving Irish, were reluctantly contributed to by many persons; and dissatisfaction was felt in some quarters at the funds collected for Quebec being placed in the hands of sectarians. But still there is no objection on the whole to collections under the Queen's letters; and this being the case, it seems that the way is plain and direct towards the creation of additional funds for Church extension.

At present we believe that *three* societies,—viz., the National Society, the Church Building Society, and the Propagation of the Gospel Society,—are recommended by the Queen's letters to the liberality of the Church; and that collections are made for each of them once in three years. There is thus a Queen's letter every year for Church purposes.

We cannot see any reason why a *second letter* should not be issued each year for CHURCH EXTENSION. It may be, perhaps, apprehended that if a second collection were made every year, the amount of the collection for the societies above alluded to would fall short of its present amount. We feel assured that this would not be the case. On the contrary, we have no doubt that the institution of a collection for Church extension would have a tendency to augment the collections for other purposes. The people at large will respond to appeals made to them, when the objects are unexceptionable; and we are satisfied that if a Queen's letter were hereafter to be issued each year, prescribing *quarterly* collections in every parish for Church societies, it would be cheerfully responded to by the Church, and that the amount now raised under Queen's letters would be more than quadrupled. But we feel that it would be premature to offer any such proposal at present. Our people must be taught the wants of the Church, and the duty of giving, more fully than they now know them; and

they will thus be ready to meet the demands which ought to be made on them.

Our suggestion, then, is, that *one additional Queen's letter*, for the present, should be issued annually for the promotion of *Church extension*. By this term we here understand, not the erection of churches or chapels, or schools, but the providing additional clergy (and lay agents, where necessary) in destitute localities.

In order to carry out this object, we want a new society—a society for CHURCH EXTENSION. This society ought to be constructed on the principle of representing the Church at large. The Sovereign should be its patron. The archbishops, bishops, and nobles of the land ought to be its president and other officers. The archdeacons, and other dignitaries of the Church, with the aid of some of the laity, ought to be its committee-men. In this society the Additional Curates' Fund Society might perhaps merge itself. It might take into association all the similar local societies throughout England and Wales. It might promote the formation of branches in all the dioceses and archdeaconries. We should be glad to see the Pastoral-Aid Society, and the Additional Curates' Fund, merge in this general society for Church extension; but we do not feel confident that these societies would deem it advisable so to do, and it is no necessary feature in our plan: it would certainly have the advantage of making the system of the Church more uniform, and of removing jealousies which at present exist. But we see the difficulties which may arise, and therefore do not press this part of the plan.

Before this society we suggest that every bishop should lay an accurate statement of the wants of his diocese—that is, the number of additional clergy and lay assistants indispensably requisite; and that the available funds of the society be allotted amongst the dioceses in proportion to their wants; the distribution of the fund being left to the bishops, aided by committees consisting of the Church dignitaries and the principal laymen in each diocese.

Were such a society instituted, there can be little doubt that it would be supported by subscriptions and donations to a large amount; and when to this was added the proceeds of a Queen's letter every year, we should think that a fund would be annually at the disposal of the society for Church extension of *at least* 50,000*l.* If this sum were applied to the payment of *salaries* to additional clergy from year to year, and *in aid of local funds* raised for that purpose, the amount disposable at once for the payment of additional curates would give a prodigious impulse to the cause of the Church. We feel convinced that scarcely less

than 1000 clergy would be thrown into the more populous districts of the country.

'A general Society for Church extension, such as we have suggested, is, we think, a real desideratum in the Church of England, and we cannot see any difficulties to prevent it. The cause is one which is very dear to multitudes of people in England. It is dispiriting to see nothing doing for its promotion, and so little hope of aid from the legislature, or from the Church's property. The institution of a society for this object would, we think, lend new energy to the efforts which are making throughout the country; and its effects would be so beneficial, that additional means would, we feel sure, be found before long for its increase.

We do not think that the "Additional Curates' Fund," excellent as its object is, can by any means supply the want which now exists. Its object is limited, and besides this, there is a kind of rival society, which would probably look with some degree of jealousy on the "Curates' Fund," if it were made the sole society for Church extension.

We have above said that by the term "Church extension," we understand an increase in the number of clergy. But we here take the term in its widest acceptation, as including *bishops*. We would not propose that the society should, either directly or indirectly, contribute to the *support* of bishops, but we would suggest that it should have as one of its objects, to *obtain* a sufficient number of bishops for the Church. There is at present no organization whatever in the Church for promoting this object; and yet it is one which most assuredly needs organization and combination among churchmen, while it is desirable that it should not be left to be advocated by any transient and temporary association, but should enlist in its support the permanent and comprehensive support of the Church itself. The cause of National Education has not retrogressed because it has been headed by the National Society. Where should we now be, was it not for the efforts of that most praiseworthy Society? Let us then have a permanent organization for the increase of our bishops and our parochial clergy, and we shall find that the cause will be more prosperous than it has been, when left to mere individual or local exertions. In making an appeal for the support of the Church generally, it would certainly be only just and reasonable to show, that the property belonging to the Church has been made available, as far as possible, for the promotion of Church objects. Much has been done, undoubtedly, in the application of the funds of sinecures to the more urgent necessities of the parochial clergy; and the good resulting from that measure has not yet been fully accomplished. But we think that it is well deserving of consideration, whether

*more* might not be effected by the property of the Church, and consistently with her general arrangements. Before we conclude this paper, we shall offer some suggestions on the subject of sinecure preferments in cathedral and collegiate Churches, which may perhaps be deemed not unworthy of notice at the present crisis.

It seems to us that the present crisis is one of the highest importance to the Church, and that on the judicious and active management of her affairs at this time, very great results are dependent. There are great questions affecting her, which are likely to engage the attention of the public ere long, and we earnestly trust that apathy, or fancied security, or a mistimed feeling of dignity, may not prevent the adoption of efforts commensurate to the occasion. The apparently divided state of the Church (we trust that division will not prevent the co-operation of churchmen for the welfare of the Church generally); the attacks in parliament on the Ecclesiastical Commission; the virulent radical opposition to the increase of the episcopate; the exertions of sectarians to extend their own system, and to prevent the extension of the Church; the important questions involved in the Bishopric of Manchester Bill; are charged with important results on the welfare of the Church herself.

That the Church of England has possessed a vantage ground over her opponents, in the possession of the episcopal sees of her ancient hierarchy, has long been felt by both friends and foes. It is something to have to contrast the succession of archbishops in the episcopal chairs of St. Augustine and St. Paulinus, with the strange and foreign titles of Romish "Vicars Apostolic;" and what authority bishops of "Debra," "Chalcis," or "Melipotamus," can claim in England, is not very evident. This is a contrast which has been long and keenly felt by many of the English Romanists; and many have been the ineffectual efforts which they have made, to induce the see of Rome to substitute bishops and archbishops possessed of the titles of the English hierarchy, for the system of "Vicars Apostolic," who derive their jurisdiction so entirely from the pope, that they might at any moment be deposed by simply withdrawing the papal license under which they act. But, though such attempts have hitherto been unsuccessful, for some secret reasons, we should think that the time cannot be very far distant, in which we shall see a rival hierarchy in England, usurping the titles of English sees. The appointments of Romish archbishops and bishops in the colonies with titles derived from the countries in which they are settled, seems an indication of what is likely to be effected in England itself before long. Of course, such a step will not in reality alter the position of the respective parties, and the very novelty of the Romish hierarchy will, for a

time, be successfully pleaded against its claims ; but we must be prepared for the annoyances which would, in various ways, result from the usurpation of the titles of English bishoprics by Romanists. If report speaks true, very great efforts are now being made, with the object of introducing this innovation.

It is curious enough to find that English episcopal titles are not only coveted by Romanists, but by Wesleyan Methodists. The pamphlet which we have placed the first on our list, a Wesleyan seriously proposes to appoint *thirty-two* bishops for the Methodists of Great Britain, a body which he estimates at a million ; two-thirds of the number being *hearers*, and not mem-

The following is his proposal :—

We return to our subject—the duty and obligation of the British Wesleyan Church, in consideration of her object and mission, to provide ministerial agency. We have endeavoured to show the advantage of a revived Methodism, and have glanced at the blessings in connexion with a localized and effective pastorate. There is, however, another class of ministers needed, we think, in our Churches ; a class with duties analogous to those of bishops in other Churches. There is the spiritual territory of the British Wesleyan Church, thirty-two districts, viz. :—

1. London ; 2. Bedford and Northampton ; 3. Kent ; 4. Norwich ; 5. Oxford ; 6. Portsmouth ; 7. Guernsey ; 8. Devonport ; 9. Cornwall ; 10. Exeter ; 11. Bristol ; 12. Bath ; 13. First, South Wales ; 14. Second, South Wales ; 15. North Wales ; 16. Birmingham ; 17. Shrewsbury ; 18. Macclesfield ; 19. Liverpool ; 20. Manchester ; 21. Bolton ; 22. Halifax and Bradford ; 23. Leeds ; 24. Sheffield ; 25. Nottingham and Derby ; 26. Lincoln ; 27. Hull ; 28. York ; 29. Whitby and Darlington ; 30. Newcastle ; 31. Carlisle ; 32. Isle of Man ; 33. Edinburgh and Aberdeen ; 34. Shetland.”

For each of these districts, the appointment of a localized minister is suggested.

The office, we need not say, is a scriptural one, and so is the title. In appropriateness, it would be idle to urge the claims of the title any more than that of ‘reverend.’ Far be the thought that any special influence would be gained, even if possible, by its assumption ; of course, the impossibility precludes the necessity of professing to possess all such desire or hope. The title and office must, of necessity, be alone spiritual.

The institution of bishops is, we contend, among the needs of the Wesleyan Church, if a due regard be paid to her duties and mission. The Church requires, in these days, an order of men to take general supervision of her work ; to be in correspondence with other churches and their presidents, and with bishops and ministers of other denominations, on matters pertaining to the good of the Church universal,



with leisure to carry out the plans and instructions of Conference; to superintend the labors of pastors and preachers; to assist in the direction of the various institutions, religious, benevolent, and educational, within their respective districts; and, though last, not without importance, to exhibit the union of learning and piety; and to assist in giving a tone to the literature of the Church. Each bishop should be provided with a lay secretary, who might occasionally be employed in his district, in attending to connexional funds, and other mere secular business."—pp. 47—49.

There would be, in fact, nothing inconsistent with the principles of Wesleyan Methodism in appointing bishops; for Wesley himself consecrated Dr. Coke a bishop; and in America the Methodists have continued to appoint bishops up to the present day. And in the increasing disposition manifested by sectarians to imitate the institutions of the Church, we may see reasons for thinking that such a proposal as that which is made by the author of the pamphlet alluded to, will hereafter be adopted.

Measures like this unquestionably tend to consolidate the ecclesiastical polity, and to promote the discipline and the effectiveness of parties who are hostile to the Church. The increase of chief pastors in a Church is a source of encouragement to all its members, and tends, as we know from experience, to augment indefinitely the efficiency of the whole body. And, therefore, it is impossible for the Church of England not to regard with dissatisfaction the institution and increase of rival hierarchies. In the course of the last eight or ten years, the Romish Vicars Apostolic in England, bearing episcopal titles, have been *doubled* in number; and it is supposed that they are now about to be increased. There are, we believe, *ten* Romish bishops at present stationed in England, for the care of a communion which, probably, amounts to half a million in number, but which its own most extravagant estimates do not raise to above a million.

If we look to America, where the Church is at liberty to develop her organization, we observe a hierarchy consisting of thirty bishops presiding over 1400 clergy, and from one to two millions of people, and we see that hierarchy increasing year by year, so that in the course of forty years it has multiplied six or seven-fold. At the beginning of this century, we believe, there were only four or five bishops in America, where there are now thirty.

While, however, the opponents of the Church of England, and branches of the Church of England, are permitted to augment the number of their bishops and pastors according to the exigencies of the times, the Church of England herself can, with difficulty, preserve her ancient sees; and only succeeds, after a struggle of unexampled bitterness in the House of Commons, in



obtaining *one additional see*, after the lapse of three centuries, in which her population has more than trebled !

We must say, that it seems to be a peculiar hardship and grievance, that while all religious communions in the country are permitted to make such arrangements as they deem advisable, for the efficient management of their spiritual affairs, the unanimous wish of the Church of England is to be met by insult, vexatious opposition, and in a spirit of bitterness unexampled in parliamentary proceedings. It would seem to have been the object of the radical opponents of that bill, to intimidate the government from any measures for the benefit of the Church. In their crusade against the Church, they received the aid of Sir James Graham, and other adherents of Sir Robert Peel; and the ministers who had introduced this measure for the benefit of the Church, relinquished that portion of it which related to the foundation of three additional bishoprics.

What may be the meaning of this relinquishment, we cannot exactly discern. It may be that the minister intends to bring forward a more distinct and definite proposal for the increase of bishoprics than was comprised in the clause which was relinquished in the Bishopric of Manchester Bill. But we cannot help suspecting and fearing that such a proposal will not be again brought forward by the present ministry. The *elections are now over*; and, without imputing interested motives to the minister, we still feel that one stimulus which might have induced him to court the approbation of the Church is at an end. Then, again, the position of the minister may not be so triumphant in the new parliament as to enable him to provoke a violent opposition from any section of the House of Commons: and therefore we remain of the opinion, notwithstanding what has occurred, that the Church must depend *on her own exertions* to obtain the necessary augmentation of her hierarchy, or to carry any other measures for her extension.

We feel convinced, that *unless public opinion manifests itself in every way in favour of the increase in the episcopate, that most important point will not be gained*. In the late debates in the House of Commons, several of the opponents of the measure observed, that the country in general had expressed no wish on the subject, and that the motion came from the bishops only. We know, of course, the total untruth of such assertions; but still it would, we think, have been well if the supporters of the measure could have appealed to petitions in its favour from the universities, the clergy, and the parishes of England and Wales. The sees of Bangor and St. Asaph were saved by the exertions of Lord Powis;

but it cannot be denied that the expression of public opinion in the shape of petitions to both Houses of Parliament, lent a very effective support to the cause which he pleaded.

It is obvious that there is a party which is bitterly opposed to any increase of the episcopate in England. We cannot doubt that this opposition is secretly instigated by the Dissenters and Romanists, who have no pretence themselves for appearing as open opposers of the measure. They are doubtless hostile to the increase of the episcopate for exactly the same reason which renders it desirable to the Church: viz. its tendency to promote the efficiency of the Church. However this may be, there is evidently a body, small indeed in numbers, but bitter and determined in its animosity, which will oppose any measure for the increase of the English episcopate; and this body, small as it is, has obliged the minister to defer, if not to relinquish his plan of adding four bishoprics to the present number, although the proposal was introduced with all the qualifications which were thought necessary to render it acceptable to a "liberal" House of Commons. No seats in the House of Lords were sought for; no charge was imposed on the taxes. The Church was to supply the funds, and to receive no increase of political power in return; and yet the measure was opposed with a virulence and an assiduity almost unexampled in parliamentary history.

We are not seeking to promote the political influence or power of the Church; we are simply endeavouring to promote her spiritual efficiency,—to place her clergy under more immediate superintendence of their superiors,—to make the Church more effective for the instruction of the ignorant, the consolation of the afflicted, and the reclaiming of the vicious; and yet our efforts are to be met by the most virulent and assiduous opposition.

We trust that all feeling of justice and fairness has not vanished, and that the claims of the Church will not long be thus resisted.

We have had many examples before us, in the last few years, of the benefits derived to the Church from the appointment of additional bishops. In the colonies the results have, of course, been most striking. But, to show that similar effects in their degree may be expected in England itself, we would merely point to the state of things in the diocese of Ripon, which the excellent bishop of that diocese has described in his recent Charge. It must, indeed, be a matter of unfeigned rejoicing to the Church to observe the progress which has been made in this diocese since its institution only ten years since; and which must be attributed, in no small degree, to the assistance and the labours of a resident bishop.

1836, there appear to have been in this diocese 295 incumbents, 300 churches and chapels, and 180 glebe-houses, of the clergy non-resident.

1846, we find 370 churches and chapels, and 225 glebe-houses, incumbents, and 120 curates, and only 27 non-resident clergy; an increase of 70 churches and chapels, besides 36 fresh school-houses for Divine worship in remote hamlets, containing accommodation for about 6000 persons; 100 *additional clergy*, with 45 new school-houses built; while there has been a decrease in the number non-resident clergy by about one-half.

As regards the erection of schools, the advance has been still more rapid, for although the number of them does not exceed 76, yet, as affording accommodation for nearly 80,000 children, it is clear that in this department we are gaining on the increase of our population; for the present number will represent a population of at least 240,000, an amount far exceeding any addition which can have accrued during that period."

These happy results are not, of course, to be attributed merely to the institution of a new bishopric at Ripon; doubtless they have been in some degree realized, if the diocese had proceeded without separate organization; but still there cannot be any reasonable doubt that the appointment of a bishop, charged with the special care of the diocese of Ripon, has tended largely to the promotion of the Church's cause. In facilitating the intercourse of the clergy with their ecclesiastical superior,—in placing them more immediately under his notice and observation, in promoting the legitimate influence of the episcopate with the members of the Church, and thus drawing forth their aid, the appointment of a bishop for that extensive district of the north of York must have exercised a very powerful influence in procuring about the good results which we have seen.

On this subject we gladly avail ourselves of the language of the Bishop of Ripon in his recent Charge, because it must carry with it more weight than any expression of our opinions could have; we feel the highest gratification in placing on record in our annual expression of sentiments so worthy of the responsible official office with which the author has been invested, and which he has so well filled.

Extending beyond the limits of our own diocese, we cannot but regard it to be a subject of mutual congratulation, that the legislature at length publicly sanctioned the principle, that some additional number of bishops in England and Wales is necessary for the government and oversight of our Church. The only marvel is, that recognition should have been so tardy; and that, in these days, when expedient for providing more effectual episcopal superintendence over more populous districts should at first have been found in the

union of ancient sees. It was throughout my own deliberate conviction, that in the case of the dioceses of St. Asaph and Bangor, that union never could take place; that the growing desire for an increased episcopacy was running counter to the spirit of an arrangement which seemed to regard such extension as hopeless, and merely cast about for the best means of adjusting more equitably the very disproportionate labours of the respective dioceses, without altering the existing number of bishops."

"The Reports, however, of the first ecclesiastical commission, and the subsequent enactments based upon them, so far from leading the minds of churchmen to acquiesce in the conclusion that any further enlargement was impracticable, served but to invite reflection to the subject. The retrospect of the past, and the fact that, although the population had nearly quadrupled since the Reformation, not one bishop had been added to the number of the Church's spiritual rulers since the reign of Henry VIII., has led, as might most reasonably be expected, to the almost unanimous conviction, that a further division of our sees, and a still further multiplication of the number of those who are to take the oversight of the Church, are necessary for its efficient government.

"And history tells us, that Henry VIII. had matured a plan for increasing the number of bishops to sixty-six, and it was to have been carried into execution by the endowment of twenty additional sees, as well as the appointment of twenty-six suffragan bishops. The act which provided for the creation of suffragans was passed in the year 1534. It continues to this day in our Statute-book, and in it are enumerated the twenty-six localities which were to become their seats; but so much has the relative population of different places changed, that Hull is the only town in Yorkshire included in the list, while in Lancashire there is not one named. For all practical purposes, therefore, that act is, at the present moment, little more than a dead letter, save in so far as it strengthens the argument, *à fortiori*, for the increase of the episcopate in these our days, when our population is multiplying to so overwhelming an amount."

The bishop thus satisfactorily meets one of the objections which was raised by the Radical party, in the recent debates on the Bishopric of Manchester Bill. It is exactly the sort of reply which is suited to the understandings of such men.

"It is often urged, in answer to this plea for increasing the number of the chief or subordinate pastors of our Church, that it is invalid, seeing that the various dissenting bodies bear so large a proportion to the whole. But you will yourselves be fully conscious, my reverend brethren, that the labours of the clergy are not limited to those alone who are regularly in communion with our Church; and that a large share of your time and toil is often bestowed on persons who are more or less connected with other religious communities. As an answer to this current objection, it may be interesting to you to gather from

the abstract of the registration returns some approximation to the ratio which the members of the Church of England bear to the rest of the people. The calculation refers to England and Wales alone, and it appears, that in a given year, since the Registration Act was passed, of the marriages performed, ninety per cent. were solemnized in the Church of England; of those who were interred, eighty-five per cent. were buried according to her rites, and by her ministers; and of those baptized, seventy per cent. were admitted into the Church according to the form prescribed by our Liturgy."

In reply to the arguments of such persons as Sir James Graham, who look upon the episcopal office as one which involves a very moderate amount of labour, and who are apparently of opinion that the number of bishops ought to be diminished instead of increased, the Bishop of Ripon thus replies, in language which is not more eloquent than true:

"If we look merely to the vast addition which is year by year made to the numbers of our people, we should infer the necessity of a corresponding increase, not only of the parochial clergy, but also of those whose province it is to take the oversight of the Church: this, however, would give but an imperfect view of the bearings of the case, as regards the episcopate; for the labours of that body may be said to increase, as it were, in a geometrical proportion. The increased zeal and activity of the parochial clergy, which I cannot but acknowledge with feelings of thankfulness and admiration, throws an additional burden on their diocesans, which they rejoice, indeed, to bear, so long as health and strength are granted them to support it. No one can be acquainted with the internal operations of a diocese, without perceiving that the existence of those numerous societies, which have been founded within the last few years to aid the Church in carrying out her spiritual ministrations, whether belonging to one diocese alone or embracing all equally, while they constantly demand the bishop's counsel and superintendence, furnish occasion for an indefinite increase of correspondence with his clergy on the various subjects connected with them.

"If, indeed, the Church expects her bishops to act merely as the censors and correctors of their clergy, and to discharge a certain round of prescribed official duties, which may be measured by the public eye, and are patent to universal observation, it might perhaps be questioned whether their numbers were not commensurate with their functions; and yet, in the matter of confirmations alone, it were much to be desired (according to my own impression at least) that they could be more frequent, and that the numbers assembled, which have been already lessened by the division of districts, might be still more reduced by further subdivision, were not this incompatible with the pressure of other obligations. But if the episcopate is to be regarded by our people generally, not merely as a name, but as a living reality, a vital energizing principle; if our bishops are to identify themselves with

their energy and their power—to throw their hearts and minds into their offices—to be known among their flocks as St. Paul was among his—to be the fathers, the fathers, and the counsellors of their clergy—settling them in their difficulties, arbitrating in differences, peace-making where their influence can avail, resolving cases of conscience with propriety, forwarding by their counsel every good work and labour of love:—if they are to be able to judge with their own eyes as to the practical working of each clergyman in his parish—to strengthen their hands in their hours of trial and perplexity—to encourage the timid and arouse the indolent—to let each congregation hear from time to time, from their own lips, the words of eternal truth, and the poor parents of every parish see that, besides their own appointed minister, there is the chief pastor of the diocese, who cares for the souls of their children, and is furthering plans for their spiritual benefit:—if, I say, these weighty charges really press upon a bishop, I know not who can be sufficient for these things, according to the present constitution of our dioceses. To say that I am myself unequal to such a burden, would avail but little in the argument, for I can well anticipate the ready reply; but I do conscientiously believe that the exertion of body and mind, which a full response to all these demands, in addition to his ordinary official duties, must require, would be far beyond the usual average of physical strength and mental ability.

“Nor is the picture which I have here attempted to draw the creature merely of my own imagination. Such is the portrait presented to us by historians and biographers of those great and good men who, in times when the numbers of their flock admitted of it, have best adorned that high office by the holiness of their lives, and the abundance of their labours, and whose praise is in all the Churches. *Such is the view taken of a bishop's duties by the framers of our services, and such are the obligations imposed upon us by our vows of consecration.* Therein we promised to instruct the people committed to our care out of the Holy Scriptures, teaching and exhorting with wholesome doctrine; as well as to maintain and set forward, as much as shall lie in us, quietness, love, and peace among all men. Therein prayer was offered for us, that we might be evermore ready to spread abroad the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the glad tidings of reconciliation with God. Therein were we charged to hold up the weak, to heal the sick, to bind up the broken-hearted, to bring again the outcasts, and to seek the lost. Therein were we warned, by the injunction of St. Paul, that we should be ‘apt to teach;’ and, by his example, that we should ‘feed the Church of God which He hath purchased with his blood.’ We are reminded how St. Paul taught publicly, and from house to house, and ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears; and how he was willing to part with life itself, if he could but finish with joy that ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus—the ministry of the Gospel of the grace of God.”

These are, indeed, worthy views of the high responsibilities of



the episcopal office; and the enunciation of these doctrines at the present day will do more to enlist the sympathies of all earnest-minded persons within the Church, than any other argument which could be advanced in behalf of an increased episcopate. We want more bishops, not merely for the relief of individual prelates—not merely to have more frequent confirmations or ordinations, or to exercise a more efficient control over the clergy—but in order to enable the bishops themselves to perform those duties which are the *principal* and *leading* parts of their office, and which have reference to the cure of souls. The bishops are not merely successors of the apostles in authority, by the imposition of hands, but they succeed to the *apostolical duties, cares, and labours*. And how beautifully does the Bishop of Ripon pursue this subject:—

“Passing from the Service of Consecration itself, we cannot glance at the Epistles of St. Paul without observing how fully these lineaments are filled up, in all their practical detail, in the cause of his general oversight over the whole of his flock. From them we learn his deep sympathy with his people in all their trials, either from within or from without. ‘Who is weak,’ says he, ‘and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?’ He tells them, that though absent from the body, he was present in the spirit, being comforted in their comfort—his joy being the joy of them all: how his people were in his heart, to live and die with them, to spend and be spent for them: how he exhorted and comforted them as a father doth his children; was gentle among them, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; being affectionately desirous of them, and willing to impart to them not the Gospel of God only, but his own soul also, because they were so dear to him.

“And while the records of Holy Scripture, the language of the Church, as well as the lives of them who have shone forth as the brightest patterns to such as should come after them, all witness to the same truth as to our duties and our office, I must be permitted to add yet one more testimony. You are, yourselves, my Rev. brethren, in some degree responsible for what I have written, for you have yourselves taught me, during the ten years’ intercourse I have had the happiness of holding with you, that such is the estimate you entertain of what a bishop’s functions should be, and such the relations in which you would fain have your diocesan stand towards you. This relation I feel it indeed a privilege to hold, while the one painful reflection which accompanies it, is the utter impossibility, arranged as our dioceses now are, of realizing all that is involved in it, coupled with the recollection of the necessarily imperfect manner in which its obligations have already been discharged, as well as the anticipation that they must be yet more imperfectly fulfilled when increasing years and declining strength shall have further impaired the ability to perform them.



"The time seems to have arrived, my Rev. brethren, when the Church of England will be called upon to decide whether she be content to acquiesce in the position that she shall have overseers who can take no such effectual oversight of the flock as her services contemplate; that the evils which have resulted from this state of things, shall not only continue without a remedy, but shall be indefinitely aggravated, as the population of the country increases, and this, without any hope of mitigation. Surely, my Rev. brethren, that such a state of things should be perpetuated, is morally impossible. It never can be, that while every other religious community in this country has full liberty to multiply the number of its superior functionaries, according to the requirements of the times, as the general body increases, and the subordinate ministers are consequently multiplied, the Church of England shall be the only one proscribed from ever adding to the amount of her spiritual rulers—alone denied the power of adapting herself to existing exigencies, and of giving free scope to all her various energies. The principle of periodical increase has happily been recognized in the gradual development of our Church in the colonies; and I never can believe but that it will likewise, from time to time, be acted upon in the economy of the Church at home <sup>1</sup>."

We offer no apology for these lengthened extracts from the Bishop of Ripon's Charge. Every Churchman must feel most grateful for the expression of such admirable sentiments, and at a crisis when they are of unusual importance. The episcopate has been openly designated in the House of Commons as very little better than a sinecure. We suppose, that on the same authority, the duties of the parish priest would be limited to reading a sermon and prayers on Sundays. If such be the opinions entertained by Sir James Graham and Sir Robert Peel, we need not wonder at the opposition which they have offered to the preservation of the Welsh dioceses, or the *ridicule* with which they met Mr. Frewen's proposal for an increase in the episcopal sees. The Church must be prepared to expect from these *soi-disant* Conservatives, and their immediate followers, no kind of support in her efforts to obtain the necessary augmentation to the episcopate. From the Radicals she will meet a virulent opposition. From the Whigs, a support which depends solely on the will of the minister. From the Protectionists, we cannot exactly say what her hopes may be; but we believe that this party steadily supported her in the debates on the bishopric of Manchester; and we suppose that they are more likely to befriend her than any other party at present.

But the Church is not a body which ought to seek for the aid of parties. If she is *obliged* to seek for their aid, she will assuredly

<sup>1</sup> St. James's Chronicle, September 14, 1847.

1. Her strength lies in the manifestation of her wishes. If the Church feels strongly on the subject, and acts accordingly, it will be impossible to withhold her claims. No ministry, and no party which hopes to govern this country, will, in the present state of things, decidedly oppose what the Church, with a united voice, requires. It is for this reason that we urge the necessity of organization and union in the Church for the promotion of church extension, and an increase in the episcopate. We think that the exigencies of the times require a special Association for these objects; and we feel assured that, under the guidance of the heads of the Church, who are deeply interested in this cause, and unanimous in its support, the efforts of that society would be crowned with speedy and remarkable success.

The point to be aimed at by the Church is, we think, a LARGE INCREASE in the number of bishops. Let her not be ashamed or afraid to seek for such a number of episcopal sees as shall be fully adequate to her wants. Let her not rest satisfied with four or half a dozen episcopal sees, but state at once, and openly, the fullest amount of her expectations. The principle having now been established, that the episcopal body may be augmented according to exigencies, it only remains for the Church and her friends to press that principle to its legitimate conclusions. The establishment of the see of Manchester in addition to the former hierarchy, is a step of the highest importance in this point of view. We feel the force of the objections which have been raised to the system of rotation in parliamentary seats, established by the last bill. It would have been safer, as a precedent, to have appointed a bishop without any seat in parliament. Undoubtedly the present arrangement, which was, we believe, originally proposed by the Bishop of Salisbury, has the advantage of placing the new bishop more on an equality in temporal rank with the rest of his brethren; but the arrangement is one which we do not think the most desirable that could have been proposed. It is certainly the disadvantage of interfering with the parliamentary seats (with five exceptions) of those ancient sees whose successive incumbents have sat in the great councils of England from the times of the heptarchy. This is no light evil, in our opinion. The seats of the hierarchy in the House of Lords depend on prescriptive right, except in the case of the sees erected by Henry VIII. This right is interfered with by the new arrangements. We should have thought it safer (in case parliamentary rank be held in some shape indispensable to the episcopal dignity), that an effort should have been made to gain two or three additional seats in parliament, to which the non-parliamentary prelates might have elected some of their number; or, if

this had been impracticable, that the see of Ripon and the sees founded by Henry VIII. (Gloucester, Peterborough, Chester, Oxford), as the *latest founded*, should have been placed (at their next vacancy) on a level with the sees hereafter to be created; and that five parliamentary seats should have been made elective, and thus furnished a representation for the five bishoprics referred to, and for all the new sees. This would, we think, have been a safer and better mode of providing for this case than that which has been actually adopted, the result of which may be, that in the course of a few years the bishops in the House of Lords may be, in the great majority of cases, bishops of new sees, while the ancient sees whose pastors have sat in parliament for a thousand years, are, for the most part, excluded.

This is an evil certainly, but we do not feel very anxious on the subject, because we trust that the benefit derived to the Church from the establishment of the principle of an increase in the episcopate, and the removal of the difficulty of parliamentary seats, will incalculably outweigh any evils resulting from a weakening of the legal argument in support of seats in parliament. As regards those seats in parliament, we should rather feel their loss an evil as indicating a disposition hostile to the Church, and as tending to the general disruption of connexion between the Church and State, than as a great positive loss to the Church. If parliamentary seats have their advantages, they have also their disadvantages—they tend to secularize the episcopal office, and they remove bishops from their dioceses more than is desirable. But there is, of course, a benefit in having representatives of religion in the great council of the nation. The mere temporal rank and station conferred by them, we do not value very highly.

The question then is, in our opinion, of subordinate importance; but the Church ought to lose no time in pressing for an ample increase to her hierarchy; such an increase as will place the episcopate in a condition fully to discharge its duties. A diocese like Ripon ought to be divided. We have the assurance of the excellent and active prelate at its head, that the diocese is too large for him to perform the duties of a bishop in such a manner as he deems essential: and if this be the case with Ripon, which is not one of the largest of the dioceses, what are we to say of such dioceses as Exeter, London, Lincoln, Manchester, Norwich, Lichfield, and many others? We feel assured that sixty bishops would be few enough for the effectual management of the twelve thousand churches of England and Wales. We are of opinion that an average of more than two hundred clergy, and near three hundred thousand souls, would afford to every bishop a large and ample sphere of employment; tasking the utmost powers

and mind to keep up with the demands of duty. With augmentation in the episcopate, the duties of a bishop assume a different character in the eyes of the world. The episcopal office would be able to develop its more important parts; it would become more than a jurisdiction; it would be a mission, an apostolate, carrying the truths of the Gospel throughout the land, administering the sacraments; teaching, correcting, encouraging, in all parts. Differences would be settled by personal examination on the spot, and amicable intercourse. Confirmations would be annual, and more persons would be prepared for annual confirmations than are now confirmed triennially. This is no mere fancy. It is a fact, that in some of the principal dioceses, where confirmations are now performed annually, the numbers are greater on each occasion than were used to be when they were only triennial. And every clergyman will feel the advantages derived from confirmation by bringing him in contact with a portion of his flock, which he finds it otherwise most difficult to influence in any way. Young persons, at the age when good impressions are of the greatest importance, are placed under a course of pastoral instruction, and, could this opportunity be offered annually, many who defer their confirmation, and are afterwards prevented by various causes, would be added to the number. The duties of the episcopate would not, we firmly believe, become less onerous than they now are, if the number of bishops were ten times as great as it is. The only result of the increase would be, that its efficacy would be far greater than it is at present.

In connexion with this subject, and with Church extension, we propose to submit to consideration, whether, consistently with the efficiency of the Cathedral establishments, and their original design and purpose, they may not be made more conducive to the benefit of the Church of England than they are at present. Under the regulations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, we propose to lay this question fairly before the reader, it seems necessary to enter into a short survey of the history of these establishments, abridged from the learned work of Thomassinus on the discipline of the Church.

During the first six centuries of Christianity, the bishop, priests, and monks of the principal church of a diocese resided indeed in the same place where their church was situated, but they did not, in general, form a community, living in the same house. Eusebius, Basil, Augustine, and some other bishops, in the fifth and sixth century, began to form religious communities of their own, in imitation of the monastic institute of Coenobites, which at that time took root in the Church; but their example was not

generally followed. The priests and deacons formed one body, of which the bishop was the head; and the Church was governed by the united action of this body, the priests and deacons being the ordinary council of the bishop. In this body we see the origin of cathedral chapters. They were supported out of the common property of the Church, of which the bishop had the chief administration. They were bound to strict residence; and as there were no benefices, but merely salaries as means of support, there were no pluralities. The bishop and the presbyters were all invested with the *cure of souls*: the bishop was so strictly bound to preach and minister in his cathedral church, that ordinarily no one else either preached or administered the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. It was unusual for the presbyters to preach in the presence of their bishop, so peculiarly was he considered to be bound to preach the Gospel. The presbyters, who constituted the chapter under the bishop's superintendence, were all engaged in the *parochial duties* of visiting the sick, administering the rites of the Church, and the other usual branches of pastoral duties. The cathedral church was frequently the only church in a city, and the priests and deacons were so many assistants of the bishop, in the care of his "parish" or diocese.

When there were several churches, besides the cathedral, they were served by the clergy of the cathedral. Thus the Emperor Justinian, in one of his *Novellæ* regulating the number of priests and clergy at Constantinople, informs us that the three churches dependent on the patriarchal church were served in order by its clergy. In fact, all the churches of the city and country were originally a kind of chapels attached to the cathedral, and served by its clergy. In the time of Pope Innocentius I., the presbyters who officiated in the chapels or parish churches of Rome were not permitted to consecrate the eucharist; but the sacrament was sent to them from the principal church, where the pope himself officiated.

Thus the clergy of the cathedral church in each diocese were always engaged in pastoral duties; and the adoption of the new rules and regulations, which began in the eighth and ninth centuries to become general in the West, did not affect the essential character of their office. From that time the priests and deacons of the cathedral began to be entitled *canonici*,—a term derived from the "*canon*" or "*matricula*" of the Church, in which their names were inscribed on being admitted to their benefices.

The *canonici*, or canons, were merely the priests and deacons of the Church, no longer permitted to live separately, but brought together into a monastery, over which the bishop presided as abbot. The rule under which the canons lived was compiled by

Arbogast, Bishop of Metz, and was taken from the monastic rules. The clergy were brought under this rule in France in the time of Charlemagne, and somewhat later in other countries; but the regulation was not long-lived, for in the thirteenth century the cathedral clergy had very generally relinquished their residence at the cathedrals, and the distinction began to be introduced between canons residentiary, and prebendaries or canons non-residentiary. The cathedral monasteries were thus deserted by many of the canons, and the funds which had been employed in the support of as many canons as possible on monastic fare, were divided and appropriated to the particular canons for life, without the power of recall, except in case of some serious offence; so that the canons ceased to receive maintenance or salaries, and became possessed of permanent benefices. This, however, did not necessarily relieve them from the cure of souls, or make them sinecurists. It was only by the gradual foundation and endowment of parochial churches in the cathedral cities that the chapters of canons were at length left without any flocks to tend; and they thus became *sinecures*, which were held with other benefices in plurality.

That canons have been, in the course of ages, placed in a position to enjoy what is called "learned leisure," was certainly not a result contemplated by the Church at any time. We have frequently heard it stated that chapters were intended especially for the maintenance of a "learned" ministry. We are convinced that this is a very great mistake. To say that the clergy of the cathedral were always expected to be superior men, because of their position as the more immediate council of the bishop, would be true; but to say that chapters were intended to be places of learned leisure, in which the clergy were to be relieved from the burden of the cure of souls, would not be correct. The presbyters or canons of the cathedral were, in their original institution, and for a long series of ages, a body of clergy engaged under the bishop in the pastoral care of the people of the cathedral city. The sinecure character which they have acquired is an innovation. We will not call it a *corruption*, though the practice of the Church has, in fact, gone far towards proving it such; for from the moment that canons were divested of the cure of souls in their original sphere of action, they assumed it elsewhere; so that it is rare indeed, in the Church history of *England* at least, for some centuries past, to find instances of canons of cathedrals who were not engaged in pastoral duties by holding parochial benefices along with their canonries. This universal practice seems to arise from a feeling in the Church, that it is undesirable to have benefices which are wholly severed from the cure of souls. To place a body of priests



in the cathedral, and to cut them off entirely from the cure of souls, was felt to be in some way inconsistent with the character of a Christian ministry. If, when the canonries became sinecures, their holders had been excluded from holding parochial benefices elsewhere, the chief engagements entered into at ordination could not have been fulfilled. A body of clergy left merely "at leisure," and constrained to form a society without any employment except that of attending the services of the cathedral church, would be placed in a position most disadvantageous and distressing to Christian zeal and charity. No really sincere and devoted labourer in the Lord's vineyard could be expected to relinquish the privileges and blessings of a parochial ministry, for a position in which he was excluded from the cure of souls. Hence arose the obvious necessity for permitting canonries to be held with parochial preferments. The endowment of parochial churches in the cities gradually deprived the cathedrals of their congregations. It became the duty of the people, which was urged on them by their pastors, to attend their parish churches; and thus these noble cathedral churches which adorn the land were in the event attended by smaller congregations than the parish churches around them.

All this was connected with the system which made canons sinecurists, and which deprived the bishop himself of the immediate cure of souls, and left him at liberty to fix his residence in any part of his diocese where his temporalities might be situated.

Here, then, is a very great change in the discipline of the Church—a change which has had its disadvantages as well as its advantages. And with the system thus constructed in the course of ages the Church has to deal in the present day. Some persons have been of opinion that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners did not introduce the reform which was most urgently needed in the cathedral chapters, and which would have consisted in bringing their members into *permanent residence*. It has been argued, that to restore the residence of a body of canons in the cathedral city, and to give them the superintendence of seminaries, or to set them at leisure for the composition of theological works, would have been realizing the original intentions of their foundation. Undoubtedly the Ecclesiastical Commissioners did very little in the way of reforming the chapters. Their office extended chiefly to applying the funds of those chapters to parochial purposes. They contented themselves with the reduction of the numbers of canons, and with the arrangements consequent thereupon, and which were absolutely essential to secure the performance of divine service in the cathedrals. Their object was to leave the



system as much as possible as they found it, merely removing its decided abuses, such as the unnecessarily large income of some of these sinecures, and the power of holding them in plurality with any number of benefices.

And in this probably the Commissioners judged rightly; for it is unquestionably desirable to make as little change as possible in the general discipline of the Church; and had they acted on the suggestions of those who urged the restoration of the chapters as bodies of clergy engaged in learned pursuits, they would not, after all, have placed the chapters in their ancient position, a position far more dignified and more influential than they now hold. It would not have restored to them the cure of souls in the cathedral city; it would not have brought back the bishop into residence, investing him with the chief ministry of the Word in his cathedral church, surrounded there by his presbytery and his deacons; it would not have restored the unity of the Church, in bringing the body of the faithful into connexion with their mother Church. The chapters brought together under the presidency of their *dean*, and not their *bishop*—for the pursuit of learning, not for the cure of souls, would have presented a picture as unlike that of ancient times as could well have been imagined.

It is, however, not to be wondered at, that, looking at the *use* which might be made of canonries, even in their present condition as sinecures, persons should be inclined to persuade themselves that such must have been the design of chapters. The notion is very widely spread, that stalls in cathedrals were instituted for the especial encouragement of “learning;” but from the facts we have stated this is obviously an error.

Before we advance further, it may be worth while to notice briefly the origin of *Deans* of cathedral churches. It has been already observed, that, for many centuries after the foundation of the Church, the clergy of the cathedral consisted of the bishop, the presbyters or canons, and the deacons. The archdeacon was the chief of the deacons, and was the bishop’s vicar. Such was the diocesan hierarchy for eight or ten centuries. The bishop himself was the president of the chapter; its members assisted him in the cure of souls, and he deliberated with them in council on all matters affecting the temporalities and spiritualities of the Church.

But when bishops began to be more occupied with temporal cares than formerly, and to be called away from their cathedral cities more frequently, it became necessary to nominate a head of the chapter, who might regulate its discipline during the absence of the bishop. While the clergy did not live in monastic communities, the archdeacon was the sole vicar of the bishop in his

absence; but when, in the eighth and following centuries, the cathedral clergy were formed into *monastic societies*, it became necessary to provide a substitute for the bishop, as well as to appoint a treasurer, precentor, cellarer, steward, &c. These offices were discharged by the members of the chapter; and it was only in the course of ages that they became endowed with separate incomes, and thus from offices became benefices and dignities. The heads of chapters were at first called *præpositi*, or *provosts*; and under them were *deans*, of whom there were generally several in the cathedral monasteries, each of them being given authority of discipline over ten members of the chapter. In the course of time the provostships having become benefices, and their incumbents having addicted themselves wholly to the care of the temporalities, leaving the care of the spiritualities to the deans, the latter became in their turn the heads of the chapters; and the office of provost being generally abolished, that of dean was, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, generally substituted for it in the cathedral chapter. This was gradually effected, in the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in many cases by the direction of the popes; and the catalogue of deans in English cathedrals begins in general about A.D. 1200. We cannot trace the succession of deans as heads of chapters from a more remote period than this.

The deans, of course, gradually became sinecurists as the other members of the chapter did; and, like them, they assumed parochial duties elsewhere in the diocese, or in any other diocese. And their residence as deans was at length permitted to be limited to ninety days in the year. So far only did the canons of 1603 go in enforcing the residence of deans at their cathedrals. But those canons, and the recent reforms in the chapters by the Church Commissioners, have left the deans at liberty to hold parochial preferments without limit of diocese, on condition of their being resident for eight months in the year at the cathedral; the latter regulation being apparently made rather for the purpose of providing for the due celebration of divine service, and the care of the fabrics, than for any other object.

The system of discipline, then, sanctioned by the Church of England for several centuries, and recently re-asserted by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and legally authorized by modern legislation, approves of the combination of parochial duties with the deaneries and other cathedral preferments. It does not indeed make that union compulsory, but it affords full scope for it at the option of individuals; and, accordingly, in the vast majority of cases, the deans and other cathedral dignitaries and members of chapters, hold parochial preferments, or professorships in the

ities, and other offices of an ecclesiastical nature, which the greater part of their time. Each member of the r is, even under the new regulations, permitted to be absent 3 months in the year from the cathedral city; from which it mt that provision has been carefully made for the employment 3e-fourths of a canon's time in parochial and other duties. canons of 1603, the provision for attendance at the cathe- as still more limited. A canon who had a parochial e was forbidden to reside more than *one month* at the ral.

are now about to found on these facts certain suggestions rence to the chapters, which may not, at first sight, be her satisfactory to all our readers; which would certainly some sacrifices on the part of those who hold the patronage onries and deaneries; and which the chapters themselves, sent, would undoubtedly view with reluctance, when first ed, as tending, in their opinion, to lower the position which ow hold in the Church. But, still holding these objections iculties steadily in view, and feeling that considerable op- n would be made to what we are about to suggest, we are of 1, that if the project be fully and fairly entertained, it will itted that it is consistent with the present discipline of the 1, while it revives, in some degree, her primitive organization; would be conducive to her extension; that it would be in ect injurious to her efficiency; and that it would be safe neficial as regards her general prospects and security.

t, then, with regard to *canonries* in cathedral and collegiate es. It has been already remarked, that they are almost bly held with *parochial preferment*. Omitting those chap- urch are to be suppressed under the recommendations of the iastical Commissioners, there are at this moment in England ales, 215 deans and other cathedral dignitaries and canons, ing non-residentiaries and honorary canons. Of these, only seem to be without preferment, in addition to their cathe- nefices. The remaining 204 members of the cathedral appear to hold 308 parochial benefices, or professorships, r offices of an ecclesiastical nature, involving onerous duties, their cathedral preferments; making a total of 512 bene- r offices, held by 204 persons. We mention these facts, intending here to imply any censure on the system which mitted so extensive an amount of pluralities, but merely ving, beyond all dispute, that canonries are, as a regular held with parochial benefices—that the duties are consi- o be strictly compatible.

principle being then so unequivocally established, it remains

for consideration, whether it is carried out in the manner most beneficial to the Church. Is it desirable that *no restrictions* should exist as to the value of the preferment which may be held with canonries, or the diocese in which it may be held? Are the canonries, made in this way, as conducive to the benefits of the Church, as they *might* be made? Let us set aside our theories of the disposal of canonries for the support of studious men in learned leisure, and let us come to the sober matter of fact, that they are always held with parochial preferments; and let us then inquire whether it is beneficial, under such circumstances, that canonries should be held with amply endowed preferments—with preferments which do not *require the aid of the revenues of canonries*. Pluralities are, in general, regarded by the nation with dissatisfaction; but it is a matter of positive *danger* to the Church when those pluralities are allowed, not merely for the purpose of supporting a clergyman in decency and comfort, but for the purpose of swelling an income into opulence. It is when we see parochial benefices of 2000*l.* or 3000*l.* a year, already more than sufficiently endowed, joined to the largest cathedral preferment, that the country is disgusted, and the Church endangered.

The present system is, we think, in this respect perilous to the Church; and assuredly it would seem, that if the nation is to feel satisfied that a real reform has taken place in the cathedral establishments, such things ought to be rendered impossible. We venture then to submit a plan by which all such danger in future would be avoided, and by which a considerable relief could be afforded to our parochial system.

We would propose, therefore, that in future all canonries, not held with professorships or offices in the Universities, should be connected permanently with specific parochial duties *in the cathedral city itself*, or, where this is impracticable, in its immediate vicinity. Wherever it is desirable to erect new parishes in a cathedral city, the canonries might be annexed to such parishes as their endowment. Where this is not practicable, they might be annexed to the *most poorly endowed parishes* in the city, or its close vicinity. To take the case of this great metropolis, we would unite the canonries of St. Paul's, which possess an income of 1000*l.* even under the new arrangements, *not* with the parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, with its 2018*l.* per annum; not with that of St. Pancras, with its 1910*l.*; or even with St. Giles's, 968*l.*, or St. George's, Bloomsbury, 1000*l.*; but with *new parishes* in the city, where tens and hundreds of thousands of people are now as sheep without a shepherd. We should then obtain at once *four new and amply endowed rectories in the city*. We should find that each of those rectors would employ one curate

at least ; and thus provision would be made for the spiritual care of many thousands of people who are now virtually cut off from religion.

We would adopt the same course with the chapter of Westminster. We have not the slightest inclination to dispute the principle of the discipline which connects stalls at Westminster with bishoprics and benefices in all parts of England ; but we think that it would be far more conducive to the benefit of the Church, if the precedent already set, with regard to *two* of the canonries which are attached to the large parishes of St. John and St. Margaret, Westminster, were followed in all cases. Surely when Westminster comprises parishes like St. James's, with 37,398 inhabitants ; St. John's, with 26,223 ; St. Margaret's, with 30,258 ; St. Martin's, with 24,917 ; not to speak of St. George the Martyr, Southwark, with 46,644 (and its *Romish* cathedral) ; Christchurch, 14,616 ; St. Saviour's, 18,219 ; Lambeth, 26,377 ; Kennington, 31,289—all of them in the vicinity of Westminster Abbey—it would seem that there could be little difficulty in finding *four new parishes* requiring endowment, and which, in being annexed to canonries at Westminster, would receive an ample provision.

Nor is this the whole amount of the benefit which might be derived from the capitular bodies in London and Westminster. It must be remembered that, besides the canons of each church, there is a body of *minor canons* attached to the establishment. Under the new regulations, the number of minor canons will not in any case exceed six, or fall short of two. In the metropolitan churches we should probably have no less than six. Here then we have *twelve* additional clergy available for parochial duties in London and Westminster. The minor canons of cathedrals are at present, we believe, almost always engaged in parochial duties, in addition to their cathedral duties. In London and Westminster there seems no reason why they should not hold the benefices at present in the patronage of the chapters of St. Paul's and Westminster, and in the immediate vicinity of those Churches, *in lieu of any incomes as minor canons*. We think that the respectability of the office of minor canon would be increased by connecting it, in all cases, with a parochial benefice ; and by this arrangement the incomes, otherwise to be paid by the Church Commissioners to minor canons, would be available for the endowment of *twelve new parishes*, with 150*l.* per annum each.

The result of our proposal, then, if carried into effect in London and Westminster alone, would be to endow gradually twenty new parishes, and to add probably from thirty to forty to the numbers of clergy.

And we will now proceed to consider its general effect throughout the country. According to the Act for regulating dean and chapter, the whole number of canons in the cathedral and collegiate churches of England and Wales will be in future 118: of these nine are used as endowments of professorships and other offices in the Universities and two are already permanently attached to parochial benefices. The available remainder is therefore 107, and taking the number of minor canonries as four, on an average, in each cathedral and collegiate church, the whole force of this body will be 428, and supposing the minor canonries to be endowments according to our proposal with chapter benefices, there will be available for Church extension, or for the augmentation of poor livings in cathedral cities, and in the patronage of the bishops or of the chapters more than 100 incomes, varying from 500*l.* to 1000*l.* and 115 of 150*l.* each.

It is very possible that in several cathedral cities it might not be desirable or necessary to found new parishes. We will take one or two cases.

At Norwich we find thirty-six parishes; few of which contain a population exceeding 2000, and only one exceeding 4000. Here then it is plain that there is no need for endowing new parishes: but we find no less than nineteen parishes in the city in the gift of the Bishop of Norwich or the chapter; and of these parishes several, which comprise a population of 2000 or thereabouts, are endowed with less than 100*l.* per annum. Here then the annexation of such parishes to canonries, with 500*l.* per annum, would at once ensure the efficiency of the Church system in places which are at present most inadequately provided for.

Now to take the case of Peterborough. The population of this cathedral city is between 6000 and 7000, with one parish church. If the four canons of Peterborough were resident in this city, and engaged in parochial districts, they would not be too many for the work before them. In the vicinity are several parishes, in the gift of the chapter or the bishop, which would sufficiently provide for the minor canons.

At Oxford there are parishes of large population and very poor endowment, which would feel the benefit of being annexed to canonries of Christ Church.

These may suffice as instances of the operation of the plan which we have ventured to suggest. There are some cathedral cities where the population is small; in such cases the benefices will probably be found to need augmentation by the annexation of canonries. Indeed, as a general rule, the provision is exceedingly inadequate for the parochial clergy in the cathedral cities. But



in many cases the canonries might be applied with great advantage to the foundation of new parishes.

At Exeter we find the parish of St. Sidwell's with a population of 9154, and an income of 252*l.*; Holy Trinity, with a population of 3796, and an income of 111*l.* Here is at once a field in which the endowment of one or two new parishes, and the augmentation of the existing parishes, could not fail to benefit the Church's cause.

To specify all the local arrangements which might be desirable, would of course require very careful examination. It might perhaps, in some cases, be found unnecessary to connect the canonries with parishes in the cathedral city. In this event the cases of most urgent necessity in the principal towns of the diocese, would be naturally attended to first. But we think that, on the whole, we have said enough to prove that the cathedral endowments may be made to contribute to a considerable extent to the wants of the Church; and that, without any violation of principle, or any revolution in existing practice.

It may be added, that to annex permanently the canonries to parochial duties *in the cathedral city or its close vicinity*, thus bringing the canons into permanent residence, would be a revival of the primitive practice, to as great an extent, perhaps, as is possible, under the altered discipline of the Church.

We now advance to a branch of the subject on which our suggestions will perhaps excite more surprise, and be viewed with greater repugnance than what has been already said on the subject of canonries. If our suggestions should seem inexpedient or impracticable, we have nothing further to say; but it seems that in the present exigencies of the Church, nothing should be left untried to make her resources available to the utmost, for the promotion of her most vital interests.

The provision for that large increase in the episcopal body, which the Church agrees to be necessary, is a question of great practical importance, and of some difficulty. Different plans have been proposed for the purpose of providing incomes for the new bishops, and amongst others, it has been suggested frequently, that the deans of cathedral and collegiate churches might be consecrated bishops, and become suffragans of the diocesan bishop. This plan would undoubtedly provide means of support for bishops; but it has the disadvantage, first, of supplying them with an inadequate endowment; for 1000*l.* per annum is, with our present feelings, an insufficient income. Secondly, it labours under the more serious disadvantage of compelling the appointment of *suffragans* only; for diocesan bishops ought not to reside in a diocese different from their own.



But it still remains a question, whether the deaneries might not be made more useful to the Church than at present; whether they might not be made available for the desired increase of the episcopate. We are of opinion that they might be made conducive to this end, and in confirmation of our opinion, we would first remark, that it has been by no means unfrequent to hold deaneries with bishoprics. Several recent instances will occur to every one. The deanery of St. Paul's is at this moment held by the Bishop of Llandaff; and the deaneries of Canterbury and of Durham have lately been held by bishops. The Ecclesiastical Commission has introduced regulations for preventing the bishops in future from holding any cathedral or parochial preferment in *commendam* with their sees, and the principle on which they acted, which was to prevent the multiplication of offices, which drew the bishops away from their dioceses, and was no longer necessary on reforms being effected in episcopal incomes, was in itself most sound and judicious. Undoubtedly it is an apparent evil for a bishop to hold a deanery, or a canonry, or a parochial benefice in some part of the kingdom remote from the sphere of his episcopal duties. But the case would, we think, be very different, if a bishop were to act as dean of *his own cathedral*. That the duties of a dean are not onerous, is generally understood and admitted. The clergy of the cathedrals for many ages had no president except the bishop, or, in his absence, the archdeacon; nor does it seem that there is any very evident reason why the bishop should not resume this office. That a chapter ought to have its head, is not denied; but why should not the bishop himself be the head of his cathedral clergy?

In point of fact, the constitution of some chapters in England and Wales distinctly shows the possibility of such an arrangement. We quote the following passage from Burn's Ecclesiastical Law (Deans and Chapters):

"There may be a chapter without any dean, as the chapter of the collegiate church of Southwell; and grants by or to them, are as effectual as other grants by dean and chapter.

"In the cathedral church of St. David's and Llandaff, there never hath been any dean, but the bishop in either is head of the chapter; and at the former, the chanter, at the latter, the archdeacon, presides, in the absence of the bishop or the vacancy of the see."

We do not suppose that in every cathedral throughout England it would be possible to act on this suggestion. The sees of Canterbury, Durham, and Oxford, occur to us at this moment as necessary exceptions. But with these three exceptions, we do not see why the bishops in every diocese of England should not

future be, as their predecessors were for a thousand years, the heads of their respective chapters, becoming, in fact, the deans of their own cathedrals.

The effect of this plan, if there were no obstacle to its being realized, would be to add to the episcopal income about 29,000*l.* per annum, and to place at the disposal of the bishops the residence houses of the deaneries for their own future residences, unless they should prefer to occupy their episcopal palaces, those places being situated near the cathedral. We believe that, including the sees of Canterbury, Oxford, and Durham, which, from their peculiar circumstances, could not enter into the proposed arrangement, there are not more than seven of the English sees, the residence houses of which are so remote from the cathedral as to render it impossible for the bishops of those dioceses to combine the duties of dean with those of bishop. In these seven sees we should be very glad to see the episcopal residence transferred to the deanery houses; and, generally speaking, there would be a considerable advantage in exchanging the present places for the deanery houses, because the latter are suited to more moderate incomes than the former; and if the episcopate is to be enlarged to any considerable extent, it will be impossible to maintain the present scale of incomes allotted to the episcopal sees.

It may be felt, perhaps, that an inconvenience would arise from the proposed junction of the offices of dean and bishop, in case of a vacancy of the see, when the number of the chapter might be so small that it might have difficulties in proceeding to an election of a new bishop. But this difficulty might, we think, be obviated by acting on clause 20 in the Act 3 and 4 Victoria, c. 113, which provides that a plan may, at any time, be laid before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by the chapters of cathedral and collegiate churches, for removing the suspension from canonries, by annexing to them some benefice in the patronage of the chapter or bishop. Under the power here given, a sufficient number of canonries might be revived and endowed with parochial benefices, so as to remove all difficulty in the case of a vacancy in the see. And here is also a power reserved in the Act for making and altering statutes of cathedrals, which would enable any arrangements to be made in reference to such revived canonries as might be deemed expedient or necessary.

The proposal which we have made has the advantage, first, of promoting the residence of bishops at their sees, at the head of their clergy, and thus restoring the ancient organization of the Church; secondly, it has the advantage of being entirely in harmony with the practice of the Church, which has permitted deaneries to be held with bishoprics and with parochial prefer-

ments to the present day, almost all the deans being at this moment holders of parochial preferment, or in the discharge of important duties besides those of their deaneries; thirdly, it has the advantage of adding nearly 30,000*l.* per annum to the provision for the episcopate, together with a large number of residence houses, which would not fail to add considerably to the means at the disposal of the Church.

The *dignity* of the chapters would, we think, be promoted and increased, instead of being diminished, by obtaining the bishop himself as their head instead of a dean in priest's orders. The bishops themselves would resume the place and jurisdiction in their cathedral churches, of which they have, in many cases, been deprived by papal exemptions. In many cathedrals the bishop does not occupy his legitimate place of authority. The dean has frequently assumed a power co-ordinate with that of the bishop, and, in some cases, superior to him. These anomalies would be removed by the restoration of the episcopal presidency, which we have ventured to recommend.

We are now about to consider what new dioceses it would be desirable to establish in England and Wales, and to examine what endowments may be looked for.

The dioceses of Bangor, St. Asaph, and Llandaff, we would leave as they are at present; but we think that a division of the diocese of St. David's is imperatively called for, and that a new see ought to be founded at Brecon, to include the archdeaconries of Brecon and Cardigan.

From the diocese of Bath and Wells we would detach the archdeaconry of Bath, and, uniting it to the archdeaconry of Bristol, erect or restore the see of Bristol and Bath.

The archiepiscopal diocese of Canterbury we would reduce to half its present size, placing the remainder of Kent under the see of Rochester, as in former times.

The diocese of Chichester we would leave untouched.

The diocese of Ely should give the archdeaconries of Bedford and Huntingdon to one new see at Bedford, and that of Sudbury to another at Bury St. Edmund's.

The diocese of Exeter should have one new bishop for Cornwall at Bodmin, and one for the archdeaconries of Barnstaple and Totness seated at Plymouth.

From the diocese of Hereford and of Lichfield we would detach the whole county of Salop, and place it under a bishop at Shrewsbury.

In the diocese of Lichfield, a new see ought to be erected for the county of Derby, at Derby.

In the diocese of Lincoln, the present episcopal see ought to

retain nearly half the archdeaconry of Lincoln. The southern part ought to have a new see at Stamford or Boston; and the archdeaconry of Stow, and the northern part of the archdeaconry of Lincoln, ought to have a new see at Gainsborough. The archdeaconry of Nottingham would require a new see at Southwell.

In the diocese of London, a new see ought to be founded at Westminster, to take charge of part of Westminster, Southwark, and Surrey.

In the diocese of Norwich, two additional sees ought to be founded in Norfolk, at Yarmouth and Walsingham; and one in Suffolk, at Ipswich.

From the diocese of Oxford, Berkshire ought to be detached, and ought to form the diocese of Windsor; Buckingham also ought to be a new diocese.

In the diocese of Peterborough, the archdeaconry of Leicester ought to be a distinct diocese and see.

In the present diocese of Rochester, there ought to be bishops of Colchester, Chelmsford, and St. Alban's; the see of Rochester being restored to its ancient jurisdiction in Kent.

The diocese of Salisbury should be divided, and the county of Dorset constitute a distinct bishopric, the see to be placed at Sherborne.

In the diocese of Winchester the Channel Islands ought to be provided with a bishop of Jersey, besides the separation of Surrey as already mentioned.

In the diocese of Worcester a new bishopric ought to be formed at Birmingham and Coventry for Warwickshire.

The see of Carlisle might remain unaltered.

The see of Chester should be divided into those of Chester, Manchester, Liverpool, and Lancaster.

The county of Northumberland should be detached from Durham, and become a distinct diocese, under the see of Newcastle and Hexham.

The archdeaconry of Craven in the diocese of Ripon ought to become a diocese, with a see at Halifax and Leeds.

The archdeaconry of the East Riding, and that of Cleveland, ought to be new dioceses, under the Bishops of Beverley and Whitby.

Thus the addition we propose amounts to thirty-one new sees, which would raise the whole number of episcopal sees in England and Wales to fifty-six, besides the bishoprics of Jersey and of Sodor and Man.

It now remains to be considered what means can be provided for the support of these bishops. The bishopric of the Channel Islands would be competently endowed by annexing to it the deanery of Jersey; so that fifty-six sees remain to be provided

for. Now setting aside the sees of Canterbury, York, London, Durham, Winchester, for which a higher scale than the rest should be fixed, there would be fifty-two sees to be considered. Of these we think that twenty-one, viz. those which would have parliamentary seats, ought to have incomes of 3500*l.*, and the remaining thirty ought to have incomes of 3000*l.* This would require the sum of 183,500*l.* To the primacy we would assign 10,000*l.* to the archbishoprics of York and London<sup>2</sup> 8000*l.* per annum respectively, and to the archbishoprics of Durham and Winchester 5000*l.*, making a total of 36,000*l.* per annum; or on the whole, an income amounting to 199,500*l.*, for the support of the hierarchy of England and Wales.

The episcopal income at present is, we believe, about 170,000*l.*; and we have already remarked, that the *deaneries* would add about 30,000*l.* to the episcopal revenues: so that this alone would enable the Church to provide additional bishops to the extent we have named, if the incomes of bishops can be safely reduced to so low a scale. On this point we cannot pretend to offer any judgment; but we are of opinion that it would be necessary, in case of any considerable addition to the number of sees, to show the country that the hierarchy of England is not *extremely costly*; that if bishops can exist in the colonies on 1000*l.* and 1200*l.* a year, and that if the see of Sodor and Man is only endowed with 2000*l.* per annum, it is not held *essential* to maintain the average income of upwards of 6000*l.* per annum in England: in fact, some of the sees are already only possessed of 4000*l.* income. Would it be too much to say, that, considering the diminution of the extent of dioceses, the bishops of old sees, who may be appointed hereafter, would be not inadequately provided for with 3500*l.*? We feel assured that it would be conducive to the safety of the Church to show, that there is a disposition, on the part of the heads of the Church, to reduce the incomes of the

<sup>2</sup> We would strongly urge, that in any plan for Church extension the crown should be given the power of raising bishoprics to the title and rank of archbishoprics. If this be not done, the effect will be, that in a short time we shall find Romish ecclesiastics holding the title of *archbishop*, in positions where the head of our Church bears an *inferior* title. The effects of this will, we are convinced, be *most injurious* to the Church. We feel confident of the truth of this, from having observed the effects of such apparent superiority in the Colonies and in Ireland. The Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, who held the rank of *protobishops* (to speak ecclesiastically), ought, in our opinion, at once to become archbishops, holding their present temporal rank and precedence. The same rank ought, without any loss of time, to be given to the Bishops of Calcutta, Sydney, Jamaica, and Montreal. Will it be for the benefit of the Church to see a Romish "*archbishop*" of London or Westminster, while the Bishop of London is possessed of an *inferior* title? We think that this inconvenience might be obviated, by introducing a provision into any measure for Church extension now to be brought forward. In a few years hence it might be unattainable, especially if proposed as a separate measure.

episcopal sees *as far as possible*, with a view to the spiritual benefit of the Church.

Should it be necessary, however, to provide larger incomes for the episcopal sees than those we have mentioned, there can be no difficulty in finding them. In the new bishoprics it would be very easy to make parochial benefices assist in the endowment of the episcopal sees; and this arrangement would have the advantage of providing *residences* as well as incomes. We mention some cases as pointing out what resources are at the command of the Church. The crown could probably obtain the patronage of such benefices by exchange of advowsons.

*Bedfordshire*: Luton, 1350*l.* *Brecon*: Llangattock, 1123*l.* *Buckinghamshire*: Hambledon, 1154*l.* *Cornwall*: St. Columb Major, 1515*l.* *Derby*: Eckington, 1595*l.*; Wingfield, 1200*l.* *Dorset*: Gillingham, 1313*l.* *Durham*: Stanhope, 4848*l.* *Essex*: High Ongar, 1282*l.*; Stanford Rivers, 1107*l.* *Hertford*: Hadham, 1621*l.*; Hatfield, 2097*l.*; Whethampstead, 1356*l.* *Lancashire*: Croston, 1050*l.*; Halsall, 3051*l.*; Lancaster, 1709*l.*; Rochdale, 1730*l.* *Leicester*: Loughborough, 1848*l.* *Lincoln*: Grantham, 1006*l.*; Tydd St. Mary, 1108*l.*; Willoughby, 1150*l.* *Norfolk*: North Creak, 1077*l.*; Feltwell, 1207*l.*; Rockland, 1022*l.*; Upwell, 3855*l.*; Walsoken, 1586*l.*; Walpole, 1259*l.* *Northumberland*: Morpeth, 1611*l.* *Nottingham*: Gedling, 1075*l.*; Plumtre, 1113*l.*; Warsop, 1020*l.* *Oxford*: Witney, 1290*l.* *Salop*: Edgmond, 2600*l.*; Hodnet, 1884*l.*; Middle, 1003*l.*; Wem, 1767*l.*; Whittington, 1224*l.* *Warwick*: Solihull, 1455*l.* *York*: Halifax, 1678*l.*; Kirklington, 1034*l.*; Sheffield, 1285*l.*; Spofforth, 1538*l.*; Wensley, 1357*l.*

We cannot doubt that means might be found for obtaining a sufficient amount of parochial benefices, eligibly situated, to aid in the adequate endowment of the new bishoprics; and the Church would assuredly offer no objection to such an arrangement.

We cannot afford space to enter at length on the subject of *chapters* for the new episcopal sees. We should think that chapters might easily be formed by assigning parochial benefices in the diocese, either in the gift of the crown or the bishop, as an endowment of the canonries; and as the office of the chapters would consist of scarcely any thing except that of electing the bishop, there could be no burden imposed on the clergy by their institution.

There is one other subject of some importance—the patronage to be placed at the disposal of the new bishops. Here again, we think that the existing chapters might very fairly contribute their aid. We have suggested that the minor canonries should be



endowed with benefices in the gift of their chapters. These offices, thus endowed, would be of course in the patronage of the chapters; but we see no object whatever in the retention of *more* than this by the chapters. There is no particular benefit to the Church in the retention of large patronage by those bodies. In the case of bishops there is an obvious expediency in the possession of it, as it strengthens the episcopal influence. Now there are, we think, about 800 benefices in the gift of the deans and chapters at present (excluding the chapter of Christ Church, Oxford). If 150 of these should be applied to endow minor canonries, or annexed to canonries, there would still be a very large residue, which might, with advantage, be applied to provide patronage for the new bishops; and if equally divided, it would place in their gift about twenty benefices each, which would probably be quite sufficient.

We are aware that various difficulties might be raised to this arrangement by the chapters; but we cannot see any solid objection in the way. The precedent of interference with chapter property for the benefit of the Church at large, has now been so fully established, that it would be impossible to take any ground of right or possession against the proposed transfer. To do so would be to oppose the doctrine sanctioned by law. Nor can any expediency be pointed out in retaining in the patronage of four canons in each diocese (who would themselves be parochial clergy under the proposed arrangements) so large a number of benefices, while the majority of the bishops were without any patronage at all. The four canons in each cathedral have no influence to establish or to maintain in the diocese at large. Its care rests, not with them, but with the bishop, according to our established discipline. Therefore there seems no reason why the patronage of a large number of benefices should be placed in their hands. That they should retain the appointment to minor canonries endowed with parochial benefices, as we have suggested, seems perfectly fair and reasonable; those officers being immediately connected with the chapters and under their direction; but to place twenty, thirty, or forty benefices in the gift of four canons, seems to us altogether unadvisable in the present state of the Church. Of course the interests of existing members of chapters ought to be fairly considered and amply provided for.

On the whole then, the result of our plan would be to provide endowments or augmentation for more than two hundred benefices; for nearly one thousand additional curates; and for thirty-one additional bishops. We feel that to carry this plan into effect would demand considerable sacrifices from the crown, the bishops, the chapters, and the Church generally. The bishops



would have to consent to reduce the incomes of their sees for the future. The crown would have to resign the patronage of deaneries, though it would be in some degree recompensed by the erection of new bishoprics. The chapters would have to relinquish the greater portion of their patronage, and to assume permanently parochial functions. Their members in future would be less wealthy, if not more laborious. Canonries would not be so much sought for by the aristocracy as they now are. The Church, again, would have to contribute more frequently to the general object of her own extension than she now does. Is it too much to hope, that in the Church of England there would be found a general willingness to make such sacrifices as are essential to the promotion of the Christian cause? Can the Church prosper without such a spirit of self-sacrifice? Can she prosper without a sufficient number of chief pastors to superintend her concerns and to stimulate her energies? Can she prosper without a large addition to her inferior clergy, in the populous cities and towns of the kingdom? Can she, in fine, afford, or safely permit, the continuance of any *sinecure offices whatever*, where millions on millions of her children are living without any sense of religion, and are left to become the prey of Romanists and Dissenters? Does it not behove her to put forth her utmost energies to regain the ground which she has lost, and to maintain her position as the National Church, at a period when incredible exertions are being made by her opponents to wrest from her the care of the people of this country? Humanly speaking, the salvation of the Church depends on her maintaining her hold over the masses of the population. Let Romanism or dissent really obtain the ascendancy, in point of numbers, and the whole endowments of the Church would be endangered. Look at the bitter hostility arrayed against her—the renewed demands for her reform in various ways—her internal divisions, and the exhaustion of her means of extension. See the excessive jealousy at the institution of new bishops, on pretence of the great need for additional parochial clergy; and then say whether it is not incumbent on the Church to combine the enlargement of the episcopate with the reduction of the incomes of its members; with the abolition of all sinecures, and the devotion of all the Church's property to making provision for the cure of souls. We feel assured that the only course now to be pursued is a bold and an open course. Let the wants of the Church be fully stated; let them be reiterated; let them be brought forward by the heads of the Church and the prelates, in such a shape that there can be no doubt of the real state of the case. If the hierarchy approve of a division of the dioceses, they will lose no opportunity

of stating their conviction, and that of their clergy and people. If the clergy are desirous of the increase of the episcopate, they will publish their sentiments: they will assemble and adopt petitions to their chief pastors and to the legislature. If the laity approve it, they will unite with their clergy in parochial petitions from every part of the land.

The watchword of the Church should be, "Advance!" "Extension!" She should not remain content with her past progress: *she should forget what has been done, in the thought of what remains to be done.* Let her not permit despondency, as to her prospects, to settle down on the minds of any of her members. Much there has been, and is, to depress and to humble us, in the deplorable apostasies which have been witnessed; and the spirit of waywardness and extravagant speculation which has led to them has left some traces behind it, which still create uneasiness. But the Church at large is, we trust and know, perfectly faithful to her principles. She has not forsaken her first faith, or turned away from the holy doctrine which was delivered to her; and, confident as we are in the firm affection of the great mass of churchmen for the Church of their forefathers, we rely on their cordial support of any large and well-digested plan for her extension. And there are many persons to whom such designs would present an evidence of vitality in the Church herself; to whom the extension of the Church would be a confirmation in her doctrine, a strengthening of their affection, and a renewal of their hopes for her success.

Those who are firmly and deliberately attached to her communion on a full examination of her claims, will indeed need no such evidences to retain them in a fidelity which they know is connected with their deepest and most solemn responsibilities. Such persons will labour for her through weal and woe, and without ever faltering in their course; but there are many weaker or less instructed minds to whom the prospect of a Church putting forth her whole energies for the gigantic work before her, and successfully triumphing over her difficulties, and not shrinking from the sacrifices requisite to accomplish her mission, would convey actual confirmation in the way of truth.

Let us look at Romanism, hitherto insignificant in England, openly proclaiming its expectations of the conversion of this nation. Extravagant as we believe those expectations, still there can be no doubt that they have largely contributed to stimulate the exertions and the hopes of the Romish party. The defection of unstable men from the Church has increased this expectation. This hope has brought to the aid of the Romish cause in England all the sympathy and *the more substantial assistance* of Roman

Catholic Europe. In a few years their hierarchy in England has been *doubled*: it is now about to be further increased, with a prospect of future augmentation to an indefinite extent. It will now, to all intents and purposes, become a rival hierarchy to our own. It will be hereafter taken into connexion with government for various reasons, and the Church of England will be put in a position altogether different from what has hitherto been the case. As in Ireland, the Church will have the precedence, but her prelates will not stand alone as they have hitherto done. Small as is the number of Romanists in England, they derive importance from their connexion with *Ireland*.

We therefore call on the Church of England to adopt measures commensurate to the crisis, and to the perils by which she is encompassed. In times of an ordinary character it is unnecessary to develop measures of a large and comprehensive description; but in extraordinary times it is indispensable to resort to extraordinary measures. To add a hundred or two of clergy, and a bishop or two, to our present numbers, would be merely a drop in the ocean. It should only be a subject of pain and self-reproach to the Church, if such were the limit of her hopes. A Christian Church ought not to be without means for her extension. If she be in earnest in the cause, means will be found. Let the Church feel that there is real hope of providing for the spiritual wants of all her members, and we do not doubt for a moment that funds will be supplied. The Queen's letter would be, in case of necessity, responded to regularly each quarter; and the funds for Church extension would be amply sufficient for all the demands that could be made upon them. Let the clergy do their duty to the Church, and the supply will not fall short, even if times of general distress and pressure should come on. Those who give will give on principles which will ensure the continuance and increase of their contributions.

---

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

---

1. Hengstenberg's Christology of the Old Testament. 2. Norton's Evidences of the Gospels—Lord's Exposition of the Apocalypse. 3. Reeves' Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down and Connor. 4. Maskell's Offices of the Church. 5. Eglise de Notre Dame, at Rouen. 6. Sermons by Manning, Garbett, Laing, Fitzgerald, Kennaway, and Nicholson. 7. Boutell on Monumental Brasses—On Glass Paintings, by an Amateur—Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society. 8. Armstrong's Pastor in his Closet—Enchiridion Juvenile. 9. Irons' Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. 10. Horst's Paradise of the Christian Soul. 11. Neale's Patriarchate of Alexandria. 12. The Protector, by D'Aubigné. 13. Handbook to Oxford. 14. Robinson Crusoe. 15. Emily Bathurst. 16. Moberly's Stories from Herodotus. 17. Evelyn's Life of Mrs. Godolphin. 18. Sutton's Evangel of Love. 19. Lord Massereene's Church Melodies. 20. Cicero, a Drama. 21. Hudson's History and Principles of the Book of Common Prayer. 22. Miscellaneous.
- 

- 1.—*The Christology of the Old Testament, and Commentary on the Messianic Predictions of the Prophets.* By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Abridged (from the Translation of Dr. Reuel Keith) by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD. London: Rivingtons. 1847.

THIS is a closely-printed volume of 699 pages, an abridgment of what, in the original, occupies three octavo volumes. The omitted matter is stated to be such as would suit only the Hebrew scholar, and would be therefore ill adapted for the general reader. Yet it must not be supposed from this that the work in its present shape has lost all claim to the attention of the student; far from it. Though brought, by certain omissions, more within the compass of such as are unacquainted with the language of the Old Testament, it will well repay the attentive study of every earnest inquirer: and if the philological discussions which have been retained do not whet the student's desire for more, they will at least point out the nature and principles of the hermeneutic discussions before him, and the painful manner in which the learned author has elaborated them.

Jealous as we are antecedently of all works bearing upon the revealed Word which come from Germany, we should probably

er have cared to become acquainted with Dr. Hengstenberg's *Christology*, had it not been for the preface of the translator. In *fact*, therefore, any of our readers should find themselves similarly *affected* upon reading the title as copied above, we will present *them* with an extract from the preface, which may perhaps induce *them* (like ourselves) to change their determination; and for *which*, if it has this effect, we feel sure they will thank us:

‘ I have long been persuaded that the manner in which the so-called *study* of sacred prophecy is conducted in England is not only a disgrace to the clergy, but a grievous injury to the Church; threatening to substitute a wild, superficial, detrimental theology, in the place of that *clear* and severe, that deep and earnest, but lowly wisdom, which the *teachings* of the Church embody, and which, I am sure, the true doctrine of the cross involves. The loosest reasoning, nay, the mere semblance of the forms of reasoning; the slightest analogy, the most fortuitous coincidences . . . though each rival system can boast of as many and as curious . . . are now thought sufficient foundations for *these* structures, all sure to deceive many by their fair fronts and symmetrical arrangements, and equally sure to fall in a few years for *want*.’

In these words we are much mistaken if the reader fail to recognize a just description of the great majority of works on prophecy which (to say nothing of earlier times) have inundated the world during the last half century—from the first “Calendar” of Mr. Faber down to Mr. Elliott’s latest “Apocalypse.” We must say, that we look upon their method of dealing with the prophetic portions of the Word of God as irreverential at least in appearance, and unphilosophical in fact. The work before us, continues Mr. Arnold,

‘ appeared to me . . . admirably suited to be a *corrective* of ‘this perverse method.’ Here we have the pattern of an investigation founded upon distinct principles; of the most scrupulous, laborious, and minute examination of the very letter of the text, combined with an honest endeavour to make the analogy of Scripture an important *element* of interpretation, and with an anxiety to trace from the text, thus carefully considered, the meaning that it really conveys. The *revelatory* and pious spirit of its author appears on every page; and I, for my own part, am convinced of the *general* soundness of his principles of prophetic interpretation, which are nearly those of our countryman, John Smith, the friend of Bishop Patrick and Cudworth, as explained in his ‘Select Discourses,’ to which Dr. Hengstenberg acknowledges his obligations.”—pp. iii. iv.

But it is time that we pass to the work itself. It is divided into three chapters. The first of these is occupied with “Preliminary

minary Observations ;" principally upon the different methods employed by Divine Wisdom in preparing the Gentile and the Jewish portions of mankind for the advent of a Redeemer, the purposes which the predictions of a Messiah served to promote among the latter people, and how far these predictions are still important to the Christian Church. Chapter ii. furnishes us with the *history* of the Messianic predictions among the Hebrews; first, those predictions which are contained in the Pentateuch; secondly, in the Messianic psalms; thirdly, in "the prophets," properly so called<sup>1</sup>. Chapter iii. embraces a long and luminous discussion on the *nature* of prophecy, which is followed up by critical examinations of various chapters in Isaiah and the remaining prophets.

One great feature brought out in chapter ii. is the *continually-increasing precision and clearness of the prophecies of Messiah*. The "Protevangelium" (Gen. iii. 15) gave an obscure intimation of Him to the fallen pair. It has been customary to find in this an exclusive reference to the Messiah, a promise that He, *the seed* of the woman, should crush the tempter. Professor Hengstenberg observes, that

"it does violence to the language to understand, by the seed of the woman, any particular *individual*; and the more so, since we are compelled to understand by the seed of the serpent a *plurality*, the spiritual children of Satan, the head and members of the kingdom of darkness, called in the New Testament 'serpents,' 'the offspring of vipers,' and 'children of the devil.' To avoid this difficulty, we must understand her posterity in general."—§ 51.

The force of this argument from *language* is not, perhaps, quite conclusive (see Gal. iii. 16): but the fact is, that this fifteenth verse of the third chapter of Genesis may be regarded as a prophecy reaching to the end of time, furnishing an epitome of this world's history from the fall of man to the final discomfiture of Satan. It may depict, in few words, that which formed the subject of many a subsequent prophetic strain, the incessant conflicts and struggles between the Church of God and the synagogue of Satan, of which this earth shall be the platform, and which shall terminate in the complete discomfiture of the latter, though not altogether without injury to the former. If the seed of the serpent be a plurality, such also may be the seed of the woman. In other words, such may be Christ, *and* his spiritual body *the Church* as it extends through each suc-

<sup>1</sup> Our author uses the term, not as the "designation of all those to whom extraordinary Divine revelations were made," but as restricted to "those who possessed not merely the *donum*, but also the *munus propheticum*."

cessive age; for the woman in the primal promise was the type of the Church just as Adam was of Christ, "the figure of Him who was to come" (compare Rom. v. 14 with Ephes. v. 23, and Gen. ii. 24 with Eph. v. 30—32): a truth which Hooker hinted at, when he wrote that "the Church is in Christ, as Eve was in Adam. . . . God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And his Church He frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of man."

Our author thus vindicates the Messianic interpretation of Gen. xlix. 10. He writes:—

"The promises which were first made to his fathers, and were afterwards delivered to Jacob himself, embraced two objects,—first, a numerous posterity, and their settlement in the land of Canaan; and secondly, the blessings which, through them, should be conferred upon all nations. How can it well be supposed that Jacob, when delivering over these promises to his sons, should stop short at their first object? . . . Is it not far more likely that, as before among the sons of Abraham and Isaac, so here also among the sons of Jacob, the *individual* should be pointed out, who according to the will of God was to be the inheritor of this promise, which was continually assuming a more definite form?" —§ 72.

For the much-disputed appellative Shiloh, the Professor prefers the interpretation of *peacemaker*; and he renders the whole passage:—

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the lawgiver from between his feet [*i. e.* from Him<sup>2</sup>], until the peacemaker comes, and Him shall the nations obey."

And then follows an explanation of one of the most difficult passages in all Scripture,—a passage which has exercised the ingenuity of philologists and historians, to make the event (which *must* be past—in part at least) to harmonize in any tolerable degree with the prediction:—

"The meaning of this language (writes Dr. Hengstenberg), according to most of the interpreters, is, that the tribe of Judah should not cease to subsist as a people, and have a government of their own, until Messiah came; that then, however, it should lose its dominion.

"We, however, (he continues) believe the following to be its true meaning:—Judah shall not cease to exist as a tribe, nor lose its superiority, until it shall be exalted to higher honour and glory through the great Redeemer, who shall spring from it, and whom not only the Jews, but all the nations of the earth shall obey."

Of an explanation so totally opposite to any with which we

<sup>2</sup> We have printed this exactly as we find it, though it is manifestly a clerical error for *him*.



have hitherto met, we will not at present say more than that it appears to us as ingenious as it unquestionably is novel. We have laid it before the reader, and it merits his attentive consideration. Two questions must be asked,—(1) Is it encumbered with philological, (2) is it encumbered with historical difficulty? To the first of these the author furnishes a satisfactory reply in the negative: “for *till* not unfrequently means *up to* and *afterwards* ;” an assertion which, after Abenezra, he illustrates from Gen. xxviii. 15: “‘Behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, . . . and will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of,’—viz. till I have brought thee again to this land; i. e. much less will I leave thee when I shall have brought thee again to this land’.” As to the question of historical difficulty, the author denies that this, too, exists. He considers that the promise is fulfilled for the portion of time up to the Messiah; inasmuch as

“the ten tribes have never had a *national* existence since they were carried away into captivity, the tribe of Judah returned, and continued to subsist till the appearance of Messiah, *the other* tribes, with *their* institutions and privileges, having long since passed away.”

Concerning the remainder, we could have desired that he had been a little more explicit. His words are,—“It was also predicted, that through the Messiah the tribe of Judah should extend its dominion over many nations. The fulfilment is shown in Matt. i. 1—16”—a reference of which we confess ourselves unable to perceive the value. But whatever may be thought of this reference, a difficulty will probably suggest itself to the mind of the reader, as presenting a serious obstacle to this new explanation of the promise under review. It is this: granting that the sceptre did not depart from Judah until Messiah came, for that the *temporary* cessation of the national subsistence during the Captivity was too small a *lacuna* to be taken into account; it must be acknowledged that the national independence *has now* long since passed away. Whatever, then, may be the yet future condition of the Jews, that can hardly be taken into account in order to eke out this fulfilment of the promise, and the intervening hiatus of at least 1900 years be passed by *sub silentio*. Our limits forbid our entering here into a discussion of this objection. We think it is capable of being answered, and we will briefly hint at the outline which we conceive the answer might assume. First of all, of course we consider the prophecy did not look to the first advent of the Messiah as the point of time when it should receive its final accomplishment: it looked beyond that,

<sup>2</sup> This is not the only passage cited in proof.

and it has yet to be fulfilled. Secondly, the other tribes have long since ceased to have a separate national existence, and Judah has given of her name indiscriminately to all her brethren. And as the throne of David was to last for ever, and consequently does last, albeit not with its pristine visibility; and as "the remnant according to the election of grace" is still God's people, for "God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew, and so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob;" so we conceive that Judah may very well be said still to subsist, though scattered among the nations, a bye-word and a reproach, shorn of her power, and denuded of her privileges. And lastly, the silence of the patriarch with regard to any interruption which might take place in the visible manifestation of the Judaic sceptre and the lawgiver's rule,—whether that interruption should be confined to seventy years' duration, or should extend over not less than 1900 years,—we conceive that the difficulty which might seem to arise from this is removed by a simple reference to a peculiarity which our author has enunciated in his chapter on the nature of prophecy, as resulting from the condition of *ecstasy* in which the true prophets of God were, while actually uttering their "dark sayings" under the influence of the Holy Spirit. The peculiar quality to which we refer is, that the prophets never "brought forward in each place *the whole compass of their doctrine*;" they never "described the events of which they speak *in all their connexions and relations*." They "uttered on every occasion merely what was communicated to the internal perception; and that only *was* communicated which was suited to the existing condition of things." Thus, while one prophet will describe a Messiah *in glory*, another prophet—or the same one at another time—will depict a *suffering* Messiah. Thus, again, "Jeremiah connects the conversion of the first-fruits of the Jews with their general conversion expected in future times, and *omits* to mention the *intermediate rejection* of the greater part." (§ 222.)

We have dwelt so long upon the prophetic announcement of the dying patriarch, that we must hasten on to the latter portions of the volume before us, merely remarking, *en passant*, that the opinion of the author touching the non-messianic reference of Balaam's prophecy, he has (as we learn from Mr. Arnold's preface) seen cause to recall in a subsequent work.

There is a class of Psalms which, it is well known, present a difficulty in their interpretation; those, namely, which contain, besides certain special descriptions fulfilled only in the history of Christ, general representations which seem better to suit a pious and suffering Israelite than the Messiah. The consequence has been, that, in order to get over the difficulty, a certain school of

expositors have agreed that in these Psalms there is a sort of *double sense*, so that Messiah does not speak in them *throughout* and *exclusively*. Such are Psalms xvi. xxii. and xxix. We observe with pleasure that the Professor does not concur in this view, a view of which we find no intimation in the New Testament. He states his reasons for dissenting from this view, and among them we find the following, which, for reasons to be hereafter mentioned, we will quote :—

“Christ, in his state of humiliation, was entirely like us in every thing, except sin; like us He placed his confidence in God; He lamented, complained, prayed. . . . In describing the general impression [of his severe sufferings], the ideas already in their minds were employed as the groundwork. As in their description of the glorified Messiah, an illustrious earthly king serves as the substratum, so here the image in general of a pious man in affliction presented itself to their minds.”—§ 151.

Our reason for quoting this is, that it is founded upon another of the peculiar properties which our author enunciates as resulting from his view of the nature of prophecy, and of which we have already had occasion to cite one. The peculiarity is this :—that the disclosures of the future made to the prophets, must have been made by means of *figurative representations*; since only *images*, and not *abstract notions*, could be perceived by persons in a state of ecstasy, in which he is of opinion they were<sup>4</sup>.

This position will, we apprehend, be found of eminent utility in the consideration of much of the language with which the prophetic books are replete. For instance, it will afford much assistance towards arriving at the true interpretation of those descriptions of which *Jerusalem*, or *Zion*, forms the prominent feature. Again (at the risk of wearying the reader's patience we mention it), it is calculated to exercise a most healthy influence over the judgment of those who are perplexed (and which of us may not well be so, when he beholds the names arrayed on either side!) in the controversy between the *literal*, and the so-called *spiritual*, or figurative, interpretation of prophecies yet unfulfilled. That the latter has found very many advocates in latter times is well known; and the absurdities into which they have run have been

<sup>4</sup> We ought perhaps to have said before, that Dr. H. devotes several sections at the commencement of his third chapter to prove that this *was* their condition; and he agrees with Tertullian in describing the difference between the ways in which the true prophets and the heathen soothsayers were affected, by the terms *ecstasy* and *phrensy*, attributing the latter to the false prophets. Bishop Horsley was of the same opinion. “Futurity” (he writes in the first of his four sermons on 2 Pet. i. 20,) “seems to have been delineated in some sort of emblematical picture, presented by the Spirit of God to the prophet's mind, which, preternaturally filled and heated with this scenery, in describing the images obtruded on the fantasy, gave pathetic utterance to wisdom not its own.”—Vol. ii. serm. i. p. 10, ed. 1812.

frequently exposed. The former method is that which found most favour in the earlier ages, and whose claims have been lately revived by a few able champions. But there is a danger attaching to this, as to other matters—the danger of running into one extreme by way of avoiding the opposite: and on this danger we apprehend that they split, who take up with the one of these modes of interpretation (whichsoever it be) to the entire exclusion of the other. For our own part, we fully recognize the justice of Dr. Todd's remark, as a general rule, viz., "that as all those prophecies, whose accomplishment is undoubted, have been accomplished literally, so we should look for as literal a fulfilment of the things which shall be hereafter". But then (as Professor Hengstenberg aptly remarks)

"this rule must be applied with caution, and be preceded by a careful examination of the system of doctrine in the New Testament. It has manifestly been *misapplied* in various ways. For instance, by those who, entirely mistaking the reality which lies at the foundation of the figure, wish to interpret spiritually all prophecies which relate to the prosperous external condition of the kingdom of God, under the pretext that the kingdom of Christ is spiritual; a pretext founded on [an] overlooking [of] the distinction between the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory, which latter, according to the New Testament, as well as the Old, is to be established on earth."—§ 245.

We must, then, learn to discriminate between the imagery and what it was designed to represent; and the learned professor has furnished us with several "marks" for this purpose. For want of such marks we have known persons much puzzled by many things in the prophetic books; and by none more so than by the frequent intimations (at the head of which, for their circumstantiality, may be placed the last eight chapters of Ezekiel) of a rebuilding of the temple<sup>6</sup> in the last times. But one of the professor's "marks" is sufficient to show the untenable nature of an hypothesis such as that noted below, founded on a too servile attachment to the "literal" plan of interpretation. It is this:—We are sometimes

"compelled (he writes) to have recourse to a metaphorical sense, or 'we should' make the prophets directly contradict themselves."

<sup>5</sup> Todd's Donellan Lectures, M.DCCC.XXXVIII. p. 4.

<sup>6</sup> In a book entitled "A Connected View of some of the Scriptural Evidence of the Redeemer's Speedy Personal Return," by one James Begg (the third edition of which was published in 1831), a whole chapter is devoted to this point, in which it is seriously argued that a material temple is one day to be erected, with an altar *whereon burnt-offerings and meat-offerings*—"bullocks," quoting Ps. li. 19, shall again smoke daily to the glory of God! Nay, even Mr. Faber himself (in a curious passage in his "Sacred Calendar of Prophecy," vol. iii. p. 475,) seems "not disinclined" to this view.

Thus to predict, arguing from Jer. xxxiii. 18, the continuation of the Levitical priesthood and of the sacrificial service, would contradict such passages as Jer. iii. 16, and xxxi. 31. This is an obvious rule. "The analogy of Scripture" must be observed in explaining the prophetic, no less than the doctrinal parts of Holy Scripture; indeed, this is none other than the Apostle's rule, when he declares, "as a leading principle never to be lost sight of" (τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες), that "not any prophecy of Scripture is of self-interpretation,"—as Bishop Horsley admirably renders 2 Pet. i. 20.

We are of opinion, that the nature of prophecy, as Professor Hengstenberg expresses it—we should rather have said, the nature of the prophetic influence—has been too little attended to. Very important principles flow from it, to the neglect of which we owe that "loose reasoning" of which Mr. Arnold so justly complains as characteristic of the mode in which most of us have hitherto approached the study of prophecy. We particularly commend to the reader's attention, that portion of this work included between the 213th and 251st sections.

Some sixty pages are devoted to the seventy weeks of Daniel, comprising an exegetical examination of the sacred text, together with an elaborate discussion of the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* of that prophetic period. To pass a hasty judgment upon a point which has arrayed against one another the pens of such men as P'rideaux and Lloyd, Mede and Lowth, Blayney and Wintle, would indeed argue presumption of the highest order; on the other hand, to enter into a critical discussion of this portion of the work before us, would imply a large expenditure of time and attention; a very much larger amount, in fact, than the writer of this notice has been at all able to devote to it as yet. Hence it must suffice to state the results to which the author's researches have brought him. These are as follows: he would date the commencement of the seventy weeks, as many have done before him, from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes; but this twentieth year he fixes at B.C. 455. (Our own countryman, Bishop Lloyd, placed it at B.C. 445, and Dr. Stonard, in a learned work, fixes upon B.C. 420.) The period of the fulfilment of the seven weeks and sixty-and-two weeks, or four hundred and eighty-three years, he makes, by a calculation independent of the difficult inquiries respecting the year of the birth of Christ, to coincide with the year 782 U.C., or 29 A.D. of the vulgar era; that is to say, this is the date of the public appearing of John the Baptist, and *therefore* of our Lord, as he strives to show, these events being separated by an interval of only six months.

With this we must take our leave of Professor Hengstenberg for the present. We trust that, should this abridged translation reach a second edition, the editor will carefully revise it, as we have detected several errors of typography in respect of textual references, which is always so puzzling. We would likewise suggest that some *system* be adopted in the numbering of the various divisions and subdivisions of the arguments. Mr. Arnold will easily perceive to what we allude, when we request him to compare the figures in brackets at the commencement of the 30th, 233rd, and 247th sections. We very much approve the principle of distinguishing the members of an argument; and we regret that a want of due attention to some fixed system has rather defeated than assisted the editor's object. This by the way, however. We cannot conclude without tendering our hearty thanks to Mr. Arnold for having brought this work before the British student in so convenient, and, generally, accurate a form; and, without pledging ourselves to an agreement with the learned author in every particular, we do unhesitatingly commend this Christology to the attention of all students of prophecy.

- 1.—1. *The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* By ANDREWS NORTON, late Professor of Sacred History, Harvard University. In 2 Vols. Second Edition. London: Chapman.
2. *An Exposition of the Apocalypse.* By DAVID N. LORD. New York: Harper and Brothers.

WE have coupled these works together, because they afford some insight into the present state of feeling and principle amongst the descendants of the "Pilgrim Fathers." Professor Norton is, evidently, one of that class of old-fashioned Unitarians, who retain their Unitarianism as a dogma, and will not advance one step beyond the heterodoxy of the last century. They are wholly left behind by the march of rationalism, and their tone has accordingly become mild and gentle as regards the maintenance of orthodoxy, while they look with extreme and undisguised aversion on those more adventurous spirits who have carried on their principles to the denial of revelation. The Unitarian has become petrified while in a state of transition to absolute infidelity; and while his principles lead him to follow the course of rationalism, his feeling would rather impel him to an alliance with orthodoxy, could the pride of his reason submit to the yoke of faith.

Professor Norton's work consists of two volumes, which might, we think, have been advantageously limited to *one*; for the greater part of the discussion in the second volume refers to the opinions



and history of the Gnostics, and has scarcely any perceptible connexion with the object of his book. The first volume adopts the usual system of argument in behalf of the preservation of the text of the four Gospels, and their genuineness ; from the collation of manuscripts ; the high value ascribed to them by the early Christians, &c. After this comes a survey of the evidence for the authenticity and genuineness of the Gospels, from the testimony of the early Fathers, and more particularly from Justin Martyr and Papias. Then follow notes on various critical and other subjects, such as the classification of copies of the New Testament, doubtful passages in the Gospels, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

The second volume contains a very lengthy discussion on the Gnostics, and the testimony which they afford to the truth of Christianity ; after which come a set of notes, amongst which is included a long treatise on the Old Testament, and on sundry other matters appendant to the main subject.

Having thus given some notion of the contents of Professor Norton's work, we must in candour say, that there is very little of novelty in his pages. The biblical student, who is familiar with the works of Paley, Lardner, or even Hartwell Horne, will find little in these volumes with which he is not well acquainted, saving and excepting their diatribes against German theology, and their sly cuts at orthodoxy. The subject of Gnosticism has been treated by Dr. Burton with far more ability and learning than we can ascribe to Mr. Norton.

We do not know whether we are to understand that Mr. Norton doubts the genuineness of the *Epistles*, as he has not included them in his defence of the Scripture. It is evident that we cannot take such matters on trust ; for at the conclusion of the work, he discloses his views of the Hebrew Scriptures, the inspiration of which he denies, and imputes to them all kinds of errors, while he admits that Christianity is responsible for the truth of Judaism.

"Such is the connexion between Christianity and the Jewish religion, that the Divine origin of the former, implies the Divine origin of the latter. Christianity, if I may so speak, has made itself responsible for the fact, that the Jewish religion, like itself, proceeded immediately from God. But *Christianity has not made itself responsible for the genuineness, the authenticity, or the moral and religious teachings, of that collection of books by Jewish writers, which constitutes the Old Testament.*

When collectively, it may appear, on the one hand, that the books have a high and very peculiar character, which affords strong evidence of the Divine origin of the Jewish religion ; and it may appear, on the other hand, that they also contain much that is incredible, and that does not approve itself to our understanding and moral sense," &c.



Mr. Norton is of opinion that "there is nothing of novelty or oldness" in such views; that they are merely giving form and voice to a sentiment, common among a large class of intelligent persons. Accordingly, he proceeds in the quietest way to set the authority of the Old Testament wholly aside. And why does he do so? because it contains statements at variance with our present knowledge on physical science, as he avers; because it does not commend itself to the philosopher, or the man of science, as devoid of difficulties. But how easy would it be to turn his line of argument against the remainder of revelation, i. e. against the Gospels themselves; and how can those who admit the argument in the one case, deny it in the other? The "genuineness of the Gospels" would speedily be demolished by such objections as this writer allows to weigh against the Old Testament.

Mr. Norton is altogether indifferent to the doctrine which prevailed on this subject, as he admits, amongst the early Christians. There can be no doubt of their firm belief in the genuineness, and the truth, and the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures. Their convictions were every whit as firm on the genuineness of the Gospels; and yet Mr. Norton avails himself readily of a testimony in the one case which he rejects in the other. After quoting the early Fathers extensively, in proof of the genuineness of the Gospels, he proceeds thus:—

"In estimating the weight of evidence which has thus far been adduced for the genuineness of the Gospels, we must keep in mind, what has not always been sufficiently attended to, that it is not the testimony of certain individuals alone on which we rely, important as their testimony might be. Those writers speak for a whole community, every member of which had the strongest reasons for ascertaining the correctness of his faith respecting the authenticity, and consequently, the genuineness of the Gospels. We quote the Christian Fathers, not chiefly to prove their individual belief, but in evidence of the belief of the community to which they belonged."—vol. i. p. 96.

This is repeated again and again, as if the professor had made a great point. One would suppose that with such views he would have admitted the weight of the testimony of the Church in support of the chief articles of the Catholic faith; but no! As soon as we come to such matters, the professor turns round, and "throws the Fathers overboard." He holds, that a thinking man must find himself in "a small minority," when he comes to consider the doctrines of Christianity. The errors of the Gnostics were not greater than those of a large majority of the professed disciples of Christ.

"The faith of the whole Christian world for two centuries before the

Reformation, had no advantage over that of the Gnostics, in being more accordant with reason and Christianity. The gross literal errors and absurdities, maintained by the Catholics of that period, are in as strong contrast with the truths of our religion, as the mystic extravagances of her early heretics. The system by which the Catholic faith was supplanted among Protestants, with its doctrines concerning the threefold personality of God, and concerning God's government of his creatures; with its representations of the totally depraved nature, capable only of moral evil, with which He brings man into being; with its scheme of redemption required by man's utter misery and helplessness; its infinite satisfaction to God the Father, made by the sufferings of God the Son; and its 'horrible decrees,' may perhaps appear to a rational believer of the present day, to stand in as open and direct opposition to Christianity as the systems of the leading Gnostics."—vol. ii. p. 81.

It is curious after this to turn to the writer's observations on German theology, which are distinguished by a tartness, contrasting strangely with the fact, of the identity of *principle* between himself and them. They occur in the course of some remarks on Baur.

"In the work of Baur, there is no critical examination of the history of the Gnostics, nor any information of value concerning them. He ascribes to them, not only without authority, but contrary to all evidence, the doctrine of an unconscious and impersonal God. His work, like those of many of his countrymen, exhibits an incapacity of thinking clearly and consistently, and of presenting a lucid and well-digested exposition of a subject; and is characterized by such a use of words, especially concerning the topic of religion, as would unsettle all their established meanings. It belongs to that class of speculative writings, of which Germany has been so fertile, treating of the most important subjects, and promulgating, sometimes with dogmatical phlegm, and sometimes with heartless flippancy, doctrines the most disastrous to faith and morals. These writings are distinguished, not so much by a want of reasoning, or an evident incapacity of reasoning, as by an apparent insensibility to its necessity or use. Every thing is assumed. The most extravagant and most pernicious theories are put forward, as if they consisted of self-evident propositions. . . . These modern metaphysicians do, in truth, belong to the age of the later Platonists and Gnostics; but they resemble them not so much through a correspondence of doctrines, as in their mystical and barbarous obscurity, in their perversion and fabrication of language, in their arrogant claims, in their contempt for the exercise of the understanding in the investigation and establishment of truth, and in their pretending to some other foundation than reason, and the revelation of God, on which to rest our highest knowledge."—vol. ii. pp. 26, 27.

Mysticism here comes into contact with rationalism; and the Christian beholds with vexation a new kind of liberty asserted,

which goes so far beyond him in its extravagance, that he dwindles down into a sort of modification of orthodoxy, and is left behind by the march of intellect. It is evident that he feels this keenly.

Now let us turn to our second American publication. This exposition of the Apocalypse, which appears to adopt all the general principles of exposition expounded by Mede, Newton, Faber, Elliott, &c., deduces from them a set of conclusions which, if they be correct, certainly throw a new light on the prophecies of the New Testament. Mr. Lord is the "Pastorini" of dissent, or rather of opposition to all Christian communions. We confess that we have not perused the whole of his large, and closely-printed, and elaborately annotated volume; but we have seen quite enough to perceive that his lucubrations will not find favour with English interpreters of prophecy generally. As a specimen of his views, we select the following passage from his exposition of the "second seal."

"The agents whom the symbol denotes are teachers, therefore, of the Church. To slay one another with the sword being to destroy by violence—as the counterpart of the natural life is the spiritual—to destroy each other's spiritual life by violence, is to sentence to an exclusion from salvation by what is deemed an authoritative act; and, in a still higher sense, to compel one another, by the power of their office, to embrace an apostate religion, by which they naturally and necessarily perish.

"What class, then, of teachers and rulers is there in the Church, in whose agency these peculiarities meet?—a usurpation of powers which Christ has not authorized; an interruption thereby of religious peace from the earth, and, finally, a compulsion of men to apostasy, in order to confirm and perpetuate that usurpation.

"All these are conspicuous characteristics of *diocesan bishops*, especially of the Asiatic, African, Greek, and Latin Churches."—pp. 75, 76.

The author argues with much pains that episcopacy is only an institution of the second century; and then remarks on the "usurpation" of authority by the bishops—their errors, divisions, and persecutions; and, after painting in very dark colours the crimes of the order of diocesan bishops in former ages, he contends that the English hierarchy since the Reformation comes under the same condemnation—that the Church of England

"is yet among the guiltiest of usurpers and tyrants. Her crown is sullied, her stole is purpled with the blood of multitudes of the witnesses of God whom she has wantonly slain; and thence, like her persecuting sisters, she is ere long to be struck by avenging justice from her throne."—p. 94.

We cannot afford space for any more extracts from this really  
VOL. VIII.—NO. XV.—SEPT. 1847. o

curious book. The English writers on prophecy would do well to study his interpretations, and to refute them. According to his view, these writers are all servants of antichrist and of the beast. His interpretations are directed against the Church of England, and indeed against Dissent itself, which he charges with the wish to ally itself with the State as an establishment.

III.—*Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor, and Dromore, consisting of a Taxation of those Dioceses, compiled in the year MCCCVI.; with Notes and Illustrations. By the Rev. W. REEVES, M.B., &c. Dublin: Hodges and Smith.*

To the general reader, this volume does not possess the same interest which it will have for those who are locally connected with the ecclesiastical districts to which it refers. It comprises a catalogue and a valuation of all the parishes in the Irish dioceses of Down, Connor, and Dromore, made in 1306, with the object of providing funds for the crusade. In the year 1188, the kings of England and France, in their respective parliaments or councils, imposed on their subjects a tax of one-tenth of their moveables and annual income, for the recovery of the Holy Land. This tax, however, after a time, became limited to the clergy. The kings of England obtained grants of it, as levied on the clergy, from the popes; but in 1274, Pope Gregory X. received, at the great council of Lyons, a general grant of the ecclesiastical tithes for six years. The tithes, however, were subsequently granted by the pope to the English sovereigns, and new valuations were made, from time to time, in order to enhance their value; and the records of one of these valuations having been discovered some time since, by Mr. Vanderzee, in the office of the Remembrancer of the Exchequer, the valuation has now been published by Mr. Reeves, and illustrated with such a body of annotations as throw light on all the names of places mentioned in it. The sources from which these annotations have been compiled, are the printed works of Colgan, O'Connor, Ussher, Ware, the Irish Record Commission, and from a large number of manuscript records. Amongst the latter, are the records of the archbishopric of Armagh, beginning with the *Registrum Milonis Suetoniam*, A.D. 1361—1380, including a Commission from Primate O'Hiraghty, A.D. 1337; the *Visitation of the Diocese of Derry*, A.D. 1397, by Primate Colton; the *Registrum Fleming*, A.D. 1404—1416; the *Registrum Swayne*, A.D. 1418—1439; the *Registrum Prene*, A.D. 1430—1471; the *Registrum Mey*, *Registrum Octaviani*, 1460—1513; *Registrum Cromer*, 1518—1535;

*Registrum Dowdall*, 1540—1584. Besides these MSS., Mr. Reeves has consulted many others bearing on his subject, and the result is certainly a most curious topographical volume, rich in Irish lore, and containing much that cannot fail to interest the historian and the antiquary.

The ecclesiastical organization of the cathedrals of Ireland appears to have been different in each diocese. At Down, John de Courcy introduced the Benedictine monks from Chester, in 1183, in place of secular canons. Of this monastery the Bishop of Down was the abbot (p. 174). At Connor also the bishop was abbot of the cathedral convent, and there was no dignitary connected with the cathedral except the archdeacon; and all capitular acts seem to have been performed by the archdeacon and clergy assembled in synod (p. 261). James of Couplith, who succeeded to the bishopric in 1321, was "elected by the archdeacon and clergy of Connor" (p. 261). At Dromore there were a dean and canons, who elected the bishops (p. 311). The present chapters of these dioceses were instituted by King James I.

Altogether Mr. Reeves is deserving of very great credit for the pains and research which he has bestowed on his subject, and for the scholar-like way in which he has executed it.

IV.—*Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae; or, Occasional Offices of the Church of England, according to the Ancient Use of Salisbury. The Primer in English, and other Prayers and Forms, with Dissertations and Notes. By the Rev. W. MASKELL, M.A. Vol. III. London: Pickering.*

WE have had occasion recently to express our sense of the value of Mr. Maskell's labours in illustrating the ancient offices of the Church of England. The present volume completes his design, including the offices for coronation, for regal obsequies, for ordination, for inthronization of bishops, for reception of the pall, for regal and episcopal receptions, for reconciliation of a Church, for degradation, for healing, and for blessing cramp-rings. These various offices are preceded by a series of learned dissertations on the subject, and the offices themselves are given at full length; so that the reader has a full and ample body of information laid before him. From all we have seen of this volume, and of the dissertations comprised in it, we think that its accuracy may be relied on. We can scarcely avoid regretting that Mr. Maskell should have introduced into his valuable work the offices for healing, and for blessing cramp-rings. Both of these rites may be fairly described as superstitious, and there is no evidence of their antiquity. The former is said to have been used in the reign of

Henry VIII., but we have written it down for any sufficient evidence of the fact. The latter has more antiquity in point, but it seems scarcely deserving of a place in this volume.

We have pleasure in recommending the volume, now completed, to all who are interested in the history of the English ritual.

v.—*Eglise de Notre Dame du Bon-Secours pour Rouen*. Paris: Hagner et Bray.

THIS is a description of a Church of very considerable architectural pretensions which has been recently erected at Rouen by the voluntary contributions of persons in all parts of France. The church had become remarkable as a place of "pilgrimage;" and the aid of the Virgin was believed to be so frequently exacted in this church to her worshippers, that on an appeal being made by the curé stating the dilapidated state of her shrine, the zeal of the faithful in all parts was excited, and the result has been the erection of certainly a very noble church. We speak of the interior rather than the exterior. The former is perhaps without fault: it is in the French style of the thirteenth century, and is very light and graceful. The roof is of stone; the windows (forty in number) are richly adorned with painted glass, being in general the gift of private individuals. The building is surmounted by a lofty tower and spire, which have, however, the defect of not standing detached from the building, but of projecting out of its roof at the west end. This, together with the perfect uniformity of the ranges of buttresses and windows, impair the effect of the exterior, and mark it as a production of the nineteenth century. The western doors are magnificently sculptured.

vi.—1. *Sermons*. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester. Vol. III. London: Burns. 1847.

2. *Christ on Earth, and in Heaven, and on the Judgment-seat*. By the Rev. J. GARBETT, Rector of Clayton, and Professor of Poetry. 2 vols. London: Hatchards. 1847.

3. *Sermons, chiefly resulting from Daily Experience*. By the Rev. DAVID LAING, M.A., late Chaplain to the Middlesex Hospital, &c. London: Rivingtons. 1847.

4. *Sermons*. By the Rev. W. FITZGERALD, B.A., of Clontarf. Dublin: McGlashan. 1847.

5. *Sermons, preached at Brighton*. By the Rev. C. E. KENNA, M.A. Second series. London: Rivingtons. 1847.

*Sermons.* By WILLIAM NICHOLSON, M.A., late Master of Magdalen Hospital, Winchester, &c. London: Rivingtons. 1847.

OF Archdeacon Manning's sermons it is needless to speak. His talents are too widely appreciated, that his book should require a helping hand from reviewers; and his reputation for orthodoxy and originality of illustration is too well grounded to demand at the hands of the public censor the stamp of approbation for each particular work. We will only say that Volume III. is quite worthy to stand beside its elder brethren.

2. Mr. Professor Garbett's sermons present, at first opening, a curious contrast with the preceding volume. The Archdeacon's—all simplicity, left to speak for itself, and win its way by its own intrinsic excellence: the Professor's—ushered into notice by four prefatory pages, recommending to your notice all the five excellencies (for he has numbered them) which characterize his performance, set forth and garnished with plenty of italics and notes of admiration. Mr. G.'s protestantism is undoubted; it is therefore no matter of surprise that he rejoices to parade the *five points!* Excellency No. 2, he informs us, is, that "the topics of which these discourses treat, though not numerous, yet reach the innermost depths and mysteries of revelation and of the human spirit!" And then he goes on to say, that "to shun them is usually the practice in *ordinary congregations.*" We know not what may be the cast of congregation or of clergy with which Mr. Garbett is most familiar; but there is no one subject in his two volumes which we have not heard treated of over and over again in the churches which *we* have had the good fortune to attend. Indeed, we should be inclined to call them rather commonplace subjects. Such, likewise, is the view we take of the manner in which they are handled. There does not appear to us to be aught that calls for special remark in these volumes. They are well enough. If we were called upon to particularize any, it would be the first in Volume II., on the Personality of God.

3. Mr. Laing's character is well known to all who have had any acquaintance, during late years, with the Middlesex Hospital, or the St. Ann's Society, as an energetic, conscientious clergyman. His sermons profess to have "resulted from daily experience;" and we think that some of them bear marks of having come so. The ninth, or *Hezekiah*, is an example, from the text, "Isaiah said, Take a lump of figs, and they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered;" a sermon on the duty of employing human means in reliance on Divine help. No doubt these discourses proved useful to those who heard them,



4. Sermons by Mr. Fitzgerald is one of those books, concerning which we involuntarily exclaim, "With what motive, or on what grounds can the author have published these sermons! Surely the same things have been said elsewhere, and as forcibly. Why add to the enormous stock of discourses which already glut the market?"

Very different is the impression left by

5. Mr. Kennaway's second series. We have before had occasion to speak favourably of this gentleman's publications. There is nothing very deep, nothing particularly original, in them; nor is the matter set forth by that grandeur of diction which in some cases attracts us; but there is an unaffected earnestness, and simplicity, and fervour about Mr. Kennaway's writings which invest them with a peculiar charm. *We see that he believes and feels what he says*; and this, by the way, is the true receipt for *genuine* popularity in a preacher. The reader will thank us for an extract. We draw one, almost at random, from the conclusion of a sermon, entitled *Real Royalty*, founded upon the double text of John xviii. 37, and Matt. xxvii. 11.

"We all love, more or less, the bravery of the world. The question for us all is, how we can overcome this love.

"(1.) If we look at Jesus in his lowliness and his suffering, this is the first means. Gaze on Him fixedly and frequently; look on Him as manifesting in this guise the hidden truth. He is showing to us all what is God's estimate of present glory. If you or I are called to the same suffering or self-mortification, we are called to a post of the highest honour; it is the very essence of glory.

"(2.) But then you may ask the question, Have I all this desire for what is great in my heart, and am I always to be satisfied with what is mean? Nay, for God tells us in his Word, that we are kings and priests,—not now *externally*, not now so as to reign over any kingdom but that of our own hearts,—but most truly to reign hereafter. In the region of heaven, amid the songs of the blessed, by the throne of God and the Lamb, we shall know that we have not sighed in vain for glory. Our deepest, widest desires shall then be satisfied.

"(3.) But the world attracts me so much, I am so fond of it; its little daily pleasures have such a power over me; how can I ever so overcome them as to attain that future glory? In answer I would say, 'Behold the man!' 'Behold your King!' It was as your representative that He endured all that we have read of this day. He is the man, the new head of hope to mankind; the King, the new and restored Sovereign of rebellious hearts. But see what He has done to secure this empire. Watch Him by night and by day; by the wayside, healing the lepers; on the green grass, feeding the multitude; beneath the quiet stars, wrestling in prayer in the garden of Gethsemane, in a very agony of water and blood; falling beneath the weight

of the cross on his way to Calvary ; piercing the very heavens with that cry of unutterable despair ; bowing languishingly, at last dying ; and then say, All this He did for me. In the extremity of his woe, I find the seeds and the earnest of my everlasting joy.

“ Turn then for a moment again to the text, and, keeping this truth in your minds, remember the solemn words, ‘ Every one that is of the truth, heareth my voice.’ We all know whether we are hearing the voice of Christ. Or, if we have any misgivings, can any say that it is not of transcendent importance that we should at once ascertain it ? Try to do so this very day. In the hall of judgment, along the blood-streaked road that led to Calvary, beneath the branching arms of the blessed cross, try, try earnestly to acknowledge with the deep emphasis of a holy allegiance, that He who hangs thereon is your King, your Lord, your God.

“ Not that we should confine these thoughts to any special occasion, or connect them with the recollections of any particular day<sup>1</sup> ; they should always be present with us when we think of royalty. Whether that thought be brought very near to us, as it is by the services of this day, or whether we muse on it as that form of power which seems to have the strongest sanction and impress of Divinity, under all views it is alike edifying and impressive. Let it be our business to look through the shadows of power which pass over us in this world, to that which is the substance and the reality. All power is from on high. ‘ The powers that be are ordained of God.’ By Him, and by Him alone, kings or queens rule and reign. All their authority is derivative ; all their glory but a reflection of his. When I look on a king, I contemplate a type of Christ ; it is the highest character of a king, that he is so. When I bow before my earthly sovereign, I acknowledge the sovereignty of Christ, which is thrown as a mantle, for a brief period, over the shoulders of a fellow-creature. When I pay my debt of loyalty to my Queen, I consecrate that loyalty by the thought of Him to whom alone all real homage is rightfully done. When I celebrate the accession of an earthly sovereign, I cast my thoughts forward—happy, thrice happy day—to *his* accession, who shall be crowned with many crowns, and enjoy a throne which is as the days of heaven, that has no limit either in extent or duration. I anticipate the day when the prophecy delivered so long ago shall be to the very letter fulfilled, ‘ Behold a King ! ’ ”—pp. 76—79.

Thoughts like these come very opportunely now, and we commend them to the attention of such among us as, having bustled through their “ season ” in this great metropolis of fashion, are now immersed in the “ little daily pleasures,” or gratifying their “ desire for what is great ” in the splendid hospitality of their country mansions. Mr. Kennaway dedicates his volume “ to the congregation of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, as a sacred

<sup>1</sup> This sermon appears to have been adapted to the Queen’s accession:

memento of four years' pastoral intercourse." We doubt not that his legacy will be most acceptable to them.

6. The last work upon our list is published "as an affectionate tribute to the memory of their beloved and lamented author, who early sank under the burden of his many labours." The sermons seem to be sound, and we doubt not were felt to be interesting addresses. In the eighteenth, we perceive their lamented author entered an energetic protest against that "theological system, fraught with all the horrors of antinomianism, which would exclude the fear of God for ever from the heart, and maintain, that never once, after the one act of faith by which Christ is received, shall a feeling of apprehension dart across the mind, or the fear of God's displeasure against sin ever disturb the security of its settled composure."—He is preaching on the text, "Perfect love casteth out fear." And he remarks that

"the glimpses (so to speak) which the Scriptures occasionally give us of the inhabitants and occupations of the upper world, disclose to us the fact, that the fear of reverence dwells within every breast, mingles with every act of adoration, and breathes forth in every song of praise."

And hence he infers,

"that the fear which is mixed with reverential awe, is not the fear which perfect love expels from the Christian's heart. We must conclude then, that the fear of terror, is the feeling of which the Apostle is speaking in the text. The word 'dread,' perhaps expresses more clearly the idea which he intended to convey. And the difference between the two affections would not be inaptly marked, if we said of a man under the influence of reverential feeling, that he *feared* God, and of one under the influence of terror, that he was *afraid* of God."

VII.—1. *Monumental Brasses and Slabs: an Historical and Descriptive Notice of the Incised Monumental Memorials of the Middle Ages; with numerous Illustrations.* By the Rev. CHARLES BOUTELL, M.A., Rector of Downham Market, Norfolk. London: Bell. Oxford: Parker.

2. *An Inquiry into the Difference of Style observable in ancient Glass Paintings, especially in England; with Hints on Glass Painting.* By AN AMATEUR. Oxford: Parker.

3. *Transactions of the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society.* Vol. II. Part III. Exeter, 1847.

THE impulse which has been given to church-building in England for the last twenty years has produced a new branch of literature, which appears to be daily acquiring more interest and

importance. We allude to the publications on ecclesiology, which are continually multiplying, and many of which are distinguished by a taste and a beauty of illustration which can scarcely be rivalled in any other class of publications. England has decidedly taken the lead in the science of ecclesiology, and is likely to retain it too; for the study is promoted by an organization which is on so large a scale as, we believe, is not in any degree rivalled on the continent; and church-building is carried on to a far greater extent in England than in any other country.

But, independently of the call for accurate information and taste as regards the erection of new churches, the restoration and repair of old ones exacts a thorough acquaintance with the principles of ecclesiology, and in this is included some knowledge of the uses of the various parts of churches. It is not to be denied that many persons have written on these subjects in a hasty and inconsiderate manner, and have attempted to force their theories on the public in a way which savours of presumption at least; but the knowledge of the first principles of the science of church architecture has gradually become pretty generally diffused amongst the clergy, and we shall be saved in future from those outrageous violations of taste and decency which were, a few years since, unconsciously perpetrated.

The publication which we have named first on our list is one of very considerable interest and value. Its illustrations, comprising copies of all the best monumental brasses in England, are very beautifully executed, and will prove instructive not only to the ecclesiologist, who wishes to decipher the age of such brasses as he may meet with, but also to the antiquarian, in the curious series of representations which they contain of the dresses of the middle ages. The brasses, as our readers are probably aware, are not traceable to a greater antiquity than the beginning of the thirteenth century; but the great majority of examples of good brasses are of much later date. The splendour of many of these is very great. We can scarcely expect that this kind of funeral memorial will again come much into use, but the publication before us will supply a series of beautiful models.

We select the following passage as bearing on the interest and uses of the study:—

“It is because of their vivid representation of the long-dead denizens of ages past,—because from generation to generation they bring before us, in all points as they were in life, the prince, the noble, the lady, the knight, the citizen, and the ecclesiastic,—the mail-clad warriors who first made Acre a name famous in the annals of British prowess,—‘the victors of Cressy and Poitiers, the knights of Agincourt,’ the chieftains of the rival roses, the royal Edwards and Henrys, the chivalrous

Bohuns, and Nevils, and Mortimers, the Howards, Beauchamps, De Veres, De Greys, and Stanleys; and with these a long array of worthies of every rank and calling,—the honoured Delamere, who ruled so worthily over the once splendid, nay, the still splendid establishment of this ancient city (St. Alban's); Grenfield and Waldely, of York; Esteney, of Westminster; Goodrich, of Ely; Bewforrest, of Dorchester; the merchant, too, of by-gone centuries, in long-flowing robe, faced with niniver, with his anlace and gypcière; and the civilian, in his appropriate gown; and, though last named, far from least in interest, esteem, and worthiness, the fair and virtuous of other days, the heroines of so many a forgotten passage of arms, many a romantic tale,—the Margarets, and Eleanors, and Philippas, whose regal eminence was enhanced by their lofty deeds.”—pp. 2, 3.

It is a curious fact, mentioned by the author of this volume, that the earlier brasses are the finest; and that this art declined, in proportion as all the other arts advanced. It seems to have arrived at its maturity in the fourteenth century, and then to have begun to decay. We do not observe that Mr. Boutell has assigned any reason for this circumstance.

We have now to turn to the second work on our list—the Inquiry into Glass Paintings. This work will be of very great aid to those who are engaged in the erection or decoration of churches; and, we doubt not, that it will be of material benefit to those artists who are engaged in the manufacture of painted glass. The work is divided into two parts, the first of which lays down rules for describing the leading distinctions of styles, which the author arranges under the ordinary nomenclature of “Early English,” “Decorated,” “Perpendicular,” and “Cinque-Cento.” The second part of the work includes observations on the present state of the art, and suggestions for its application to particular purposes, and the best means for its advancement. The writer is of opinion, that it is a mistake to suppose that glass painting cannot be now practised without a strict and servile imitation of the models of the middle ages, as if it were not a distinct and complete branch of art, which, like many other mediæval inventions, is of universal applicability, and susceptible of great improvement.

Several chapters of the work are devoted to a history of the distinguishing characteristics of the styles of painted glass, in chronological order. The following remarks on the choice of subjects are worthy of notice.

“The subjects which appear best suited to glass-paintings, are those which, when executed, are of themselves pleasing objects, and are favourable to a display of the translucent qualities of glass. Of this kind are ornamental patterns, and a variety of other designs capable of being properly represented in a simple, hard, and somewhat flat manner; by

road masses of stiff colouring, hard outlines, and vivid contrasts of light and shade. A group sculptured in bas-relief, would, for example, afford an excellent model for a glass painter, on account of its want of apparent depth, and the means taken to counteract, as far as possible, its cause of indistinctness, the simplicity of the composition namely, and the sharp lights and broad shadows of the figures. The landscape background might indeed be almost directly copied in a glass-painting." -p. 241.

The author thinks that a glass-painting is not to be estimated merely by its brilliancy and beauty of colouring, independently of its pictorial qualities, as in this case, pattern glass-paintings must be always preferred to picture glass-paintings. In order to render available the translucent quality of the glass, it is recommended that the mosaic system of glass-painting be adopted, in preference to the enamel, or the mosaic enamel system, as affording greater strength of colour and brilliancy. The cinque-cento glass is referred to as a proof of the superiority of this style to either of the others. The objection against the mosaic system, which is founded on the supposed harshness of outline, where a separate piece of glass is employed for each colour of the picture, is met by observing that still greater difficulties and objections present themselves, when, as in the other styles, the picture is cut into rectangular pieces, or divided into large pieces by metal work. It is remarked, that the metallic frame-work of an early English medallion window, decidedly improves the effect of the glass, by rendering the main divisions of the design more distinct.

Having established the position that the mosaic is the only true system of glass-painting, the author proceeds to examine how far the four ancient styles of glass-painting can be employed in modern work. The result of this examination is, that for the present at least, the early English and decorated styles must be discontinued; and that, though the perpendicular and cinque-cento styles may be followed with more or less success, it is desirable that a new and independent style should be adopted. The merits of the styles when proposed for practical application, depend on a compliance with two conditions. First, the possibility of exactly imitating the proposed style; and, secondly, its appropriateness to the building for which it is designed. Now the general effect of a glass-painting depends quite as much on the *quality* of its materials, as on the mode of working them; so that in order to produce an exact imitation of the old glass-paintings, we must have the same materials as those of which they were made.

"But the modern material is identical, or nearly so, only with the glass of the first half of the sixteenth century, and is essentially differ-



ent, in texture and quality, to the glass used in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and, indeed, until almost the close of the fifteenth century; the dissimilarity increasing according to the antiquity of the example."—p. 269.

The author proceeds to exemplify this difference in various respects, and remarks that the difference between ancient and modern glass, results not only from a difference in the material, but also from a different mode of manufacture in improved furnaces, which insure a more perfect fusion and amalgamation of the vitreous particles than could, perhaps, have been effected in the ancient furnaces.

The author remarks on the bad and feeble effect often produced by modern windows which are thoroughly mosaic in character, as medallion early English windows, and coloured borders of that and the decorated style. When these are executed in modern glass, the different colours appear to a distant spectator to be confused and blended together; and sometimes this evil is enhanced when ancient designs of a mosaic character have been copied on a *reduced scale*. The perpendicular style, in the author's opinion, may be successfully copied for modern churches, as the material of the glass admits of it; but he still thinks that the imitation will not be perfect. He is of opinion, however, that it would be a great error to copy the bad drawing of the old glass paintings, merely to obtain a conformity with their general effect. We copy the following remarks with pleasure, as evincing a sound and enlightened judgment.

"If it should be thought that the objections which I have urged against symbols are without weight, I should still suggest that it is injudicious at the present day, when hostility to every thing savouring of popery has been awakened, to run the risk of raising a prejudice against so useful and appropriate a style of ornament as painted windows, by wounding this sensitiveness, even though we should think it excessive. No pretext should be left for the quaint puritanical remark, that popery can creep in at a glass window as well as at a door."—p. 232.

We cannot help questioning the propriety of introducing figures in church windows, when we remember the language of the homilies on the subject of such paintings in churches. It would, we think, be more consistent to avoid such representations, and to limit ourselves to ornamental patterns, or quarries with decorated borders, or with texts of Scripture. The object of painted glass is, decoration, not *instruction*. Every one can see the beauty of rich and varied colouring, but not one person in ten thousand, we believe, is led to think of the history of those who



may be represented. There seem to be objections to the use of figures in glass, as there are to that of statues or images in the interior or exterior of our sacred edifices.

The third volume which we have mentioned at the head of this article, affords evidence of the success which has attended the institution of the Exeter Architectural Society. It is probably known to our readers, that the excellent Bishop Medley took an active part in organizing this Society, and in the earlier parts of its career. We have already had, on more than one occasion, to express our sense of the value of the papers comprised in the Transactions of this Society. The Quarterly Report contains a description of two churches, near and at Exeter, which have been recently erected, but one of which remains unfinished for want of sufficient means. The Report of the Visiting Committee is particularly interesting; and we should be glad to see such visitations take place in all parts of the country, for the clergy would frequently derive much assistance and encouragement in the work of church restoration from communicating with persons well qualified to advise them. The engravings accompanying this volume comprise several coloured representations of decorated windows in Exeter cathedral, and are very beautifully executed.

VIII.—1. *The Pastor in his Closet; or a Help to the Devotions of the Clergy.* By the Rev. JOHN ARMSTRONG, B.A., Vicar of Tidenham. Oxford: Parker.

2. *Enchiridion Juvenile, &c.* Bathoniæ: S. Sims.

THOSE who are acquainted with Mr. Armstrong's Sermons on the Festivals will readily acknowledge his fitness for the composition of such a work as he here offers to his fellow-labourers. From what we have seen of this little volume we can most cordially recommend it as a manual of devotions to the clergy. They will find in it the expression of all those wants and feelings, and the remembrance of all those duties, which their high and sacred calling demands. There are prayers or meditations (for they comprise both characters) for every day of the week, besides general devotions. We have derived much edification from this little manual.

The "Enchiridion Juvenile" is a collection of religious rules and devotions for young persons, in the Latin language, and is borrowed, with some alterations, from Neumayr's "Methodus Vitæ Christianæ." The arrangement of this pleasing manual is such as to impress its principal moral lessons clearly and forcibly on the mind. The prayers which are at the conclusion, are

chiefly derived from our approved English divines, such as Patrick, Sherlock, Nowell, &c. Altogether we have not observed any thing objectionable in this manual, and have seen much to approve.

IX.—*Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. Parochial Lectures. (Third Series.) With a Preliminary Essay on the Teaching and Priestly Offices. By WILLIAM J. IRONS, B.D., Incumbent of the Holy Trinity, Brompton, Middlesex. London: Masters.*

No one can rise from the perusal of this work of Mr. Irons without feeling that he has been made to think on some of the most vital questions affecting the Church of Christ. We must confess that Mr. Iron's style appears to us occasionally somewhat too ambitious, and that in his writings there are obscurities which might have been avoided. His tone also is not always what we should have recommended. And yet we feel that there is so much with which we can sympathize in his writings—there is so earnest a mind—a spirit of such faithful and sincere attachment to the Church of which he is a minister, so much independence in the formation of his opinions, and consistency in maintaining them,—that, notwithstanding any minor points in which we may be unable to follow him, we cannot rise from the perusal of his work without expressing those feelings of respect which appear to us to be his due. Mr. Irons, in the work before us, (which we should scarcely have deemed suited for *Parochial Lectures*,) is engaged in developing all the features of the parochial system, as represented in the formularies and canons of the Church Universal, and as it is derived from the institutions of the Apostles. The pastoral duties of the episcopate in the first ages is described with great truth and accuracy in the following passage :—

“ One rule, with probably few exceptions in those days, was, that the head of each large *παροικία*, or parish, should be a consecrated bishop. The primitive Christians believed in the blessing of the Apostolic guidance and presence of the bishop with his flock. A bishop was not regarded *merely* as the channel of holy orders, but as the constant guide, adviser, and friend of the whole Christian flock. This was the episcopacy of St. Ignatius's epistles, and the apostolic canons; a kind of episcopacy worth believing in. There was nothing merely technical or formal in this: it was the life-blood of the primitive system. The bishop was the spiritual monarch of the Christian people; he reigned in their hearts. . . . Take all the circumstances, and the Church did all that was possible then, to carry out the idea of a sacred government of men on earth. She taught them obediently to rally round their centre, or bishop, and conform their practice to the laws of the Divine Spirit

speaking in her holy apostles. To the bishop alone, the 'watching for their souls' was given: he alone was (so to say) the 'parish priest,' having the sole spiritual 'cure.' To him, having indeed no earthly lands, or legally secured possession for the Church, the Christian people sent their offerings, which 'they laid by on the first day of the week;' and he gave alms to Christ's poor, and supported his presbyters. All the sacred jurisdiction of the society of Christians, in each place, was thus administered by the bishop, acting often in council, but at times also delegating authority to others for special works. The sacraments were to be administered in the Church as far as possible by the bishop himself. . . . Behold then, ere we pass on to far other times, a bishop of the second and third centuries! He is the ruler, the parish priest, the confessor and adviser of all the Christians within his reach; whose names he knows, and whose families he baptizes, whose sins he corrects, whose sorrows he shares, whose missionary teachers he pays, to whose wants, if they are poor, he ministers, from the common fund in his charge."—pp. 28—30.

Mr. Irons then traces the institution of the parochial system, as dioceses became too large for the care of the bishops and presbyters of the city, and the gradual alteration in the episcopal duties which ensued. And he remarks on the contrast between the bishop in primitive times, when he was the centre, soul, and life of the Christian system, and the bishop of the present day, when bishoprics have become large enough to be provinces, with archbishops at the head. All holy bishops, he observes, have for ages bewailed, as Bishop Wilson did, the difficulty of restoring discipline or enforcing the canons of the Church. And the reason of this is, the enormous size of modern dioceses, which render the bishop's influence altogether unknown to three persons out of four. The task, in fact, assigned to each prelate, however good he may be, is as impossible for him to fulfil as that which is intrusted to the presbyters under him.

"If any one pretends that the Christian hierarchy was intended by its Divine Founder to terminate in being one large bishopric on earth, embracing one whole mass of baptized, unsuperintended souls, he is asserting what the papists, practically at least, also assert; and making every bishop little more than we make the presbyter,—viz., the *delegate* of a higher earthly power. But for us, who believe that episcopacy is a reality, it remains that we cease not to strive to make it *felt* as such, and brought home as such, to every member of Christ. This can only be achieved by such a multiplication of dioceses as never yet entered the scheme of any Church reformer of this age."—pp. 43, 44.

The writer of this work is one of those who deeply feel the defects of discipline in the Church, and the want of communication between the people and their ministers. He draws a painful pic-

ture of the danger besetting an earnest-minded person from the want of spiritual guidance and direction in the Church; and he speaks of the interference of some of the clergy in parishes which do not belong to them. We trust that if evils of this kind are occasionally found, they may be removed. The clergy are, in fact, in our larger parishes completely overburdened with duties, and they are unable to give that attention to the state of particular souls which they could desire. But it is our firm conviction, that if a clergyman has a parish of such dimensions as he can fairly manage, there is nothing to prevent him from holding spiritual intercourse with all those who are desirous of availing themselves of it, and of guiding and directing them in their religious duties. We believe that this is actually the case, to a greater or less extent, wherever the clergyman is really earnest in his desire to discharge the duties of his office, and where he is not charged with a parish of such dimensions as render it unmanageable.

Mr. Irons, in his appendix, takes notice of the Romish theory of the unity of the Church. He observes, that many persons have been entrapped into admitting a certain doctrine of unity, and then find themselves obliged to admit that the Greek Church and the English are in a state of schism. This doctrine is founded on the admission in the Creed, that the Church is ONE, and is a VISIBLE body. The oneness, or unity of the Church, Mr. Irons understands to mean its unity in reference to the SPIRIT which inhabits it. There is one Church, or one body; some of whose members are in the unseen world, some live, and some yet unborn. The militant Church is not Christ's one body, but a part of it. But how is a Christian to know that he is in this one body? Is there not a representative, or sign, or instrument of that unity, accessible to individuals of every age? Yes: the one continuous Church of apostolic and baptismal descent, is visible every where in its local head—its bishop. According to the Romanists, every part of the Church militant is bound to consider itself under one head—the pope. According to our theory, each part of the Church at one place is bound to have one head—the bishop. These are the two theories; and the same objection, he says, lies against both. The local Church is certainly but a *part* of the whole, but so is the *living* Church only a part of the whole. (pp. 88—94.)

Mr. Irons is of opinion, that the controversy with Rome hereafter will be decided, not by mere arguments on matters of jurisdiction, schism, &c., but by the question of doctrine—"vital, fundamental, Christian doctrine;" and to demonstrate the error of the papal theory ever so fully will not avail, if "ever the time comes that the Catholic doctrine is rooted out of the Church." That there is no peril of any such event we most firmly believe;

for assuredly there seems little prospect of the truth being without firm and determined defenders and advocates. We should be most inclined to fear if we saw any spirit of discontent or of despondency invading the defenders of the truth; and we trust that the Church will feel the value of their aid, and that they will be rewarded by a confidence and approbation, which they have merited by patient continuance in well-doing, and by faithful and undeviating adherence to sound principle, amidst the fluctuations of party and of the opinions of the day. In these days it behoves the Church to rally around her as many as possible, amongst her sons, who have evinced a spirit of fidelity and of attachment to her doctrines. To repel men otherwise meritorious for slight errors, would be a very mistaken course.

x.—*Paradise of the Christian Soul, enriched with choicest delights of varied piety.* By J. W. HORST. Adapted to the use of the English Church. London: Burns. 1847.

THE *Paradise of the Christian Soul* forms another, we hope the concluding, volume of a series of devotional works by Romanists, which, it is well known, Dr. Pusey has for some time past been translating and “adapting”—as he says—“to the use of the English Church.” We have two objections to make to this “series.” First, we object to the books themselves; secondly, we object to the principle.

Our notions do not quite accord with Dr. Pusey’s as to the manner in which he has performed his task of *adaptation*. A comparison with the originals of Avrillon, Surin, and Horst, would show that he has done much in this line; but we wish he had done more. The volumes are not sufficiently Anglican for us; i. e. to meet our views of what devotional books ought to be, intended for the use of members of our reformed branch of the Church. It were an ungracious office to pick holes in a labour of love (such as all Dr. Pusey’s works are), and it were an useless task to occupy the time of our readers by an enumeration of the little points which offend us in this translation of Horst. We will, therefore, merely direct attention to one or two, and pass on. Part i. chapter iv., is headed “*Rosary, Oblations, and Daily Exercises to the most Holy Trinity;*” and after reciting the first four petitions of the litany, we find the following rubric:—

“Then the rosary is said in three divisions of ten. At the beginning of each ten, or at the three larger beads of the rosary, the Lord’s Prayer is said, and the angelic hymn from Revel. vii. . . . At each of

the smaller beads read the words of the seraphic Trishagion, Isa. vi., and of the Ecclesiastical Doxology."

Have we, then, come to this, that English churchmen and churchwomen in the fourth century after the Reformation are returned to *counting their beads*? Does Dr. Pusey seriously approve of rosaries, or think that repeating the Lord's Prayer thrice, and the Doxology seven-and-twenty times in succession can be a help to devotion; or that this is "adapted" to the English Church? Is this "supplying food in such form as the Church of England would give it?" He tells us in his *advertisement* (p. iv.), that "his standard in so doing was not his own, but that which the homilies of the Church of England so often inculcated," &c. And yet these very homilies, to which he appeals, "rehearse some other kinds of *papistical superstitions and abuses*, as of beads and rosaries, of stations and jubilees, of hallowed beads<sup>1</sup>," &c.

Nor can we approve of "Affections of the devout soul, expressed in rhythm to *the members*," i.e. the limbs, "of Jesus Christ crucified;" and still less of "Salutations to the *five wounds* of Christ." Doubtless different minds are differently constituted; but, for our own part, this repeating of hymns, addressed to the feet, the knees, the hands, and so on of our blessed Lord—this particularizing and separating of his wounds, and praying for certain virtues, classified each with some one of them, would rather distract than direct, rather fritter away than concentrate, our devotions; and we believe that we speak the sentiments of most members of our Church. The rubric (we employ the term for want of a better) at p. 46 of Pt. vi. informs us, that "this is the chief point of meditation on the passion, to conceive therefrom hatred for sin, and love for virtue;" but it is very difficult to understand how this parcelling out of our blessed Saviour's sufferings, and distributing of them, can promote this hatred or influence this love, better than meditation on the entire mental image of the Son of the Blessed, led like a lamb to the slaughter, and taking the chastisement of our peace upon Him.

But supposing that the books were in themselves ever so unexceptionable, we should still object to them *on principle*. Dr. Pusey states that "he had a twofold object" in the adapting this series:

"First, to supply with the sort of food their souls desired, a class of minds who could not but be the objects of the deeper sympathy, be-

<sup>1</sup> Homilies, b. i. serm. v. pt. 3.



cause, from the circumstances of our times, they often know not where to find it. . . . In a word, he wished both to supply wants which he knew to exist, and to save persons from the temptation of seeking out of the Church, where God had placed them, what might be supplied to them within her."

Now all this is very affectionate and kind ; but what does it all mean ? It means (at least to our apprehension) in plain English, that there are persons in our Church possessed with a certain morbid restlessness of devotion, a yearning after some high-wrought fervour of religion, which they have pictured to themselves. This cannot be other than an unwholesome, a diseased state of religious feeling. How does Dr. Pusey deal with this ? Does he try to correct it, to cure it ? He indulges it. He tells such persons that their own Church is unable to supply their wants ; he confesses that piety has been of growth too stunted upon reformed soil, to have afforded food for such souls as theirs. This is the practical interpretation of the republication of these Romanist divines ; and we need hardly observe how highly undeserved a stigma it casts upon our Church. But we hold that it does more than this : it carries, no doubt, a very fair and considerate appearance to prepare a diet suited to the patient's wants, in order that the hearty appetite and strong digestion of the healthy labourer shall not be put off with the light food of the child. But (as has been already said) *we* do not believe the "souls," for whom these works are intended, to be in a healthy state ; and we hold it to be most unwise thus to cater for them. Let us state the truth boldly : *these persons have a secret longing and leaning towards the Church of Rome* ; and to cure this, he helps them to devotional works borrowed from that very Church ! He appears to us (we speak, of course, of the apparent result, and not of the Doctor's intentions and motives) to anticipate their longings ; to pass by the Church which ought, and *surely could*, correct their wanderings ; he thus gives them to taste how sweet the produce of the forbidden tree, even in this mangled form ; he "brings them on their way ;" and then wonders and laments if they "follow on" to satiate the appetite which he has whetted ; and, by no difficult transition, in place of the rosaries and salutations, the addresses to the cross, and prayers *for* the departed, to which he has inured them, they substitute worship of the saints and adoration of the crucifix<sup>1</sup> ! Alas ! alas ! how clearly does all this bespeak what so many other acts and

<sup>1</sup> How much more wholesome the advice which Mr. Keble once proffered to Dr. Arnold,—to cure himself "not by the physic of reading and controversy, but by the diet of holy living."—*Mutanda mutantur.*



words of his have evidenced—the weakest of judgments and the best of hearts.

We have deemed it our painful duty to say this much. We have hitherto abstained as much as possible from this subject; but the time has arrived for speaking out. We turn, in conclusion, to a more pleasing task: we hail the many assurances which Dr. Pusey gives in his *advertisement*, of his attachment to the Church of his baptism. He speaks of his wish not

“to recommend to her [the English Church’s] children any thing but what, according to the best of his judgment, was in accordance with her principles.”—p. iv.

Again:—

“This ‘definite standard’ was, to the editor, Catholic antiquity, regard being also had to the tone of mind of the Church in which, by the mercy of God, he has been admitted to minister.”—p. vi.

Dr. Pusey is staunch on the invocation of saints.

“For,” says he, “however it may be explained by Roman Catholic controversialists, to be no more than asking prayers of members of Christ yet in the flesh, still, in use, it is plainly more; for no one would ask those in the flesh to ‘protect us from the enemy,’ ‘receive us in the hour of death,’ ‘lead us to the joy of heaven,’ . . . or use any of the *direct* prayers for graces which God alone can bestow, which are common in Roman Catholic devotions to the blessed virgin.”—p. vii.

It is peculiarly interesting, too, to hear *him* speaking on the subject of *development*:—

“While acknowledging the ‘authority of the Church in controversies of faith,’ (Art. xx.) he [Dr. P.] could not understand on what ground that vast system, as to S. Mary, could be rested, except that of a new revelation. ‘Development’ must surely apply to the expression, not to the substance of belief. It must be the bringing out in words of what was always inwardly held; the securing of the old, not the addition of any thing new. . . . It seems inconceivable that S. Peter, S. John, and S. Paul, should have believed what is now earnestly taught and believed upon authority *within* the Roman Church, as to the *present* office of the blessed virgin, or that believing it, they should have written as (e. g.) S. Paul wrote through the Holy Ghost, in the Epistle to the Hebrews; or that, if the Almighty had willed it to be believed in the Church, it should have been so excluded from Holy Scripture, and the doctrine itself not have appeared for centuries.”—pp. ix. x.

We are thankful for all such passages as these solemnly put forth to the public. They are a sufficient denial, and ought to be a sufficient silencer, to the taunts and insinuations—at least, for the present—which are so liberally dealt out, in some quarters,

against the Reverend Canon of Christchurch. We shall anxiously watch and hope for a redemption of the pledges herein implied. In conclusion, we beg Dr. Pusey to believe, that in making the remarks to which we have given utterance above, we have been influenced solely by a sense of duty—as guardians of the public press,—which constrains us to prefer the general good to individual feelings.

**XI.**—*A History of the Holy Eastern Church. The Patriarchate of Alexandria. By the Rev. JOHN MASON NEALE, M.A., Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead.* In 2 vols. London: Masters.

A HISTORY of the Alexandrian Church is a great undertaking, comprising as it does, not only the history of the most important controversies of ancient times, but that of the Greek and the Monophysite communions in later ages, even to the present day. We own that we had our misgivings, on opening these volumes, that we should not find in them the fair spirit of criticism, or the research, which such a work undoubtedly requires. We have, however, been agreeably disappointed. The work is really a very respectable addition to our ecclesiastical histories. It does not, as may be supposed from its size, abound in unnecessary details, or digressions, but plainly and straightforwardly tells its story; and we are bound to say, that its style is unambitious and clear, its arrangement good, and the amount of research displayed most creditable to the author. Mr. Neale writes, as he tells us, “not as a member of the Roman, not as a member of the English Church; but as far as may be, with oriental views, feelings, and even, perhaps, prepossessions.” The work is dedicated to a prelate whose titles are probably new to the majority of our readers. “To his Holiness, Artemius, by Divine mercy Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria, Libya, Pentapolis, and all the preaching of St. Mark, and Œcumenical Judge.” It is lamentable to reflect, that this spiritual representation of St. Mark the Evangelist, and of St. Athanasius the Great, stands alone at the head of the Egyptian Church, being in fact the *only* bishop of the Catholic Church in that great Patriarchate which was once ruled by one hundred bishops.

Will the time ever come, when England or Italy shall present the same picture of desolation? Orthodox Christianity in Egypt, is, indeed, something of the past. The Coptic or Monophysite heresy still remains, and with a regular succession of patriarchs and bishops. It is far more numerous and flourishing than that of

the Eastern Church, from which it separated; but its adherents, as well as those of the Greek or Eastern Church, are sunk in the most profound ignorance. There is a solemn lesson to be learnt by the Church from such facts as these. They prove that mere orthodoxy of doctrine will not, under all circumstances, maintain the cause of the Church against its opponents. In this case, indeed, orthodoxy of doctrine was on one side, but image-worship was on the other. The great influence possessed by the monks of Egypt, was amongst the chief causes of the success of the Monophysite heresy there; for they gave it their most energetic support—a fact which should be borne in mind by those who are advocates for monasticism in the present day.

While the Roman emperors possessed dominion over the province of Egypt, the orthodox Church remained recognized and established by the state; but, on the transfer of Egypt to the hands of the Mahommedans, a revolution took place.

“With the arrival of the Saracens, the Jacobites became, in a certain sense, the Christian establishment of Egypt. It is true they were sometimes exposed to persecution; but they always retained a degree of consequence and reputation; and, in the eyes of the Mussulman, the Jacobite patriarch was *the* patriarch of Alexandria. It is not difficult to account for this state of affairs. The Jacobites were, in the first place, by far the more numerous body: if we may believe Makrizi, the number of the Melchites did not amount to four hundred thousand.

“Furthermore, from the circumstance that the Catholic faith was the faith of the state, all the civil governors and officers in the army, all, in short, who had offered any opposition to the Mahommedans were orthodox in their creed: a circumstance not calculated to procure it much favour in the eyes of the conquerors. Again, the Jacobites had suffered so severely from the emperors of Constantinople, that, for the most part, they welcomed with open arms a change of dynasty; and thus procured favour in the eyes of their new masters. It may also be remarked, that the Melchites were, for the most part, Greeks, or of Greek extraction; the Jacobites, native Egyptians. The Mussulmans, therefore, could not but regard the former as the immediate dependants of their great enemy, the emperor of Constantinople. Greek usages were beginning among them to supersede, as they afterwards did in a far more engrossing manner, national rites; and the circumstance that, however much in defiance of the canons, the Catholic patriarch was now usually consecrated in the imperial city, would render him an object of suspicion to the Saracens.

“To all this, we may add two further considerations. The one, that the natural tendency of error is to unite with error; the other, that the Catholic Church could not have been surprised in a more inopportune hour. The master came; but she was not prepared. Her chief pastor was a heretic; and the sympathy and communion of the rest of Chris-

tendom, which might have supported and cheered her, were withheld or wanting."—vol. i. pp. 72, 73.

The orthodox Church was, from the moment of the Saracen invasion, completely identified with the cause of the emperors of Constantinople. The patriarch, Peter, who had been promoted by the emperor, finding the Saracen rule established in Egypt, *retired to Constantinople*, thus deserting his flock in the hour of danger. The result of this fatal proceeding was, that multitudes of those who had been members of the Church, united with the successful party of the Monophysites, to whom the Churches were delivered, and who became, in all respects, established. So grievous was the blow then received by the Church of Alexandria, that for seventy years the see remained vacant, the emperors probably claiming the right of appointment, and the Christians of Alexandria being unwilling to venture on such a step as that of electing a patriarch. During this period, the episcopal succession was preserved in some parts by bishops consecrated in Syria for the Egyptian Churches. It was during this interval that the cause of orthodoxy received a blow which it has never recovered.

This lamentable history brings to our mind, not what Mr. Neale alludes to as occurring to a Romanist—the history of his own connexion in England—but the history of the Church in Scotland, to which it presents many remarkable points of resemblance. In both these cases, (i. e. Scotland and Alexandria,) the dissenters were stronger numerically than the Church, and had been treated with severity by the temporal power. In both the Church attached itself to the temporal power, and fell with it in a change of dynasty. The Saracens and King William supported and established the party which received them with cordiality, and discouraged the party which adhered to the cause of their opponents. And such will always be the case where the Church takes a part in revolutionary contests, and happens to side with the losing party. But, even in this case, it is possible, by subsequent moderation, and submission to "the powers that be," to obtain advantages for the Church from temporal rulers. Had the Scottish bishops and Churchmen, instead of adhering obstinately to the cause of James II., and joining in the insurrections promoted by his party, quietly submitted to the established government, they would have retained the greater part of their people, who were driven by persecution to conform to the established Presbyterian religion. The abstinence of the temporal power from persecution would have been a most important benefit to the Church. It received, during eighty or ninety years of its Jacobitism, a blow which is, perhaps, irreparable. Should any revolution ever take place in Ireland, the

same results would probably follow, with some variations. In this case the Irish Church would probably adhere faithfully to the English government, and the most exterminating persecution would be the result, ending in the almost total extinction of the Church. No step could have been more fatal than the departure of the head of the Alexandrian Church at the crisis of its fate. His death, by the sword of the enemy, would have had a far less injurious effect on the interests of his communion.

We extract the following instructive passage on the election of a patriarch of Alexandria at the end of a vacancy of seventy years.

"The long widowhood of the Church of Alexandria was now about to come to an end; and the courage and constancy of those who during its course had upheld the faith of Chalcedon, was to meet at length with its reward. The circumstances which gave them courage, at this juncture, to elect a patriarch, were not clearly stated. Cosmas, on whom their choice fell, was a *needle-maker, who could neither read nor write*, but a man, as the event proved, not unequal to the management of the Alexandrian Church, in such difficult and critical times. He found that the situation of his flock was most deplorable. Branded as Melchites, (royalists,) they were naturally viewed with all the suspicion which attaches itself to the character of an alien and an intruder: crippled in resources, tainted with heresy, robbed of their ancient possessions, deprived of their ancient rights, their situation was, to the eye of man, almost hopeless. Thebais was almost utterly lost; Ethiopia entirely heretical; so was Nubia; the bishops were few; the laity dispersed; the Church viewed with suspicion both by east and west, as infested with Monothelitism. Cosmas, however, determined on an appeal to the caliph's sense of justice; and for this purpose he took a journey to Damascus. He was, by some means, possessed of the good-will of some of Hischam's secretaries, who possibly, as was not unusually the case, were Christians; and by their means, he obtained a favourable audience from the caliph. He explained the fraud which had been practised by the Jacobites on the first emirs; he proved that he himself was the real successor of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril; and that consequently to him were the patriarchal revenues and the churches due. Hischam wrote back to the emir commanding him to put the Christian churches, with all their appurtenances, into the hand of Cosmas; and the latter returned with the mandate to Misra. In what manner it was fulfilled, it is not easy to determine accurately. That many of the churches were given up is certain; and among them were the Cæsarean and the Angelium, to which latter the Catholics could have no claim; at the same time, it is equally certain that many were retained by the Jacobites. Thus the Catholic Church became once more partially re-established in Egypt."—vol. i. pp. 107—109.

This is a remarkable instance of what may be effected by

a Church, even when in a state of extreme depression. Had the Scottish Church, in good time, tendered its adherence to the established order of things in Scotland, and sought the restoration of some of its rights, it would have succeeded. The application made to the caliph doubtless proved to him the willingness of the Melchites to submit to his rule, and therefore he viewed it with favour. The American Church has only prospered in proportion as it has showed itself national, and as not adhering to the cause or party of a foreign power. The Church should endeavour, as far as possible, to avoid the character of partizanship in great revolutions, and to devote herself to her spiritual duties, without mingling in contests for thrones. If she should from unhappy circumstances be driven into such contests, it should be her effort to retire on the first opportunity. Her duties do not extend to maintaining dynasties on their thrones, but consist in obedience.

Mr. Neale seems to have spared no labour in consulting all the original sources of information within his reach. Le Quin's work, *De Patriarchatu Alexandrino*, Renaudot's "History of the Jacobite Patriarchs of Alexandria," Wansleb's work on the Jacobites, and the Chronological Series of the Alexandrian Patriarchs, by the Jesuit Sollerius, have furnished extensive materials; and information has been obtained directly from the orthodox and the Jacobites of Egypt. Besides these, the writings of Eutychius, Elmacinus, Makrizi, Abulpharaj, or Gregory Bar-Hebræus, Ludolph, Geddes, La Croze, have been consulted and criticized. The whole work is divided into six books; the first extending from the foundation of Christianity to the rise of Nestorianism; the second, containing the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies; the third, from the beginning of the great schism till the subjugation of Alexandria by the caliphs; the fourth, to the time of Saladin; the fifth, to the first interference of the Portuguese in Ethiopia; the sixth, to the present time.

On the whole, we have to express the value of Mr. Neale's labours. We are not certain that we can agree with some of the sentiments occasionally stated; but the general tone is good, and the whole work is really creditable to the research, and the truthfulness, and impartiality of the author.

XII.—*The Protector: a Vindication.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D.D. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

HISTORY is truly a marvellous thing, not only in the uncertainty which hangs over many of its most acknowledged facts, but



the strange way in which the same facts can be represented by different minds. The name of Oliver Cromwell is not one of those which excites any feelings of admiration in an English mind: it is identified with all that is most fearful in a character. Ambition, cruelty, treason, arbitrary and tyrannical proceedings, regicide, combined with a dark fanaticism or a detestable hypocrisy, are the outlines of the Protector's character, according to our received opinions and views of history: and yet, in the face of all the strong facts which are alleged in support of this popular view, Mr. Carlyle and Dr. Merle D'Aubigné have taken on them, the one, we believe, from a love of singularity, and the other from a fear of popery, to whitewash the Protector's character, and to present him to our eyes as a demigod or a saint. Mr. Carlyle advocates the former view, Merle D'Aubigné the latter.

Throughout the strange book now before us, Cromwell is presented in the character of a *saint*! From the first his biographer, or rather eulogist, is obviously determined to hold him up as a model of Christian perfection. Poor man! he has no conception of the union of hypocrisy with fanaticism,—the strange mingling of earthly with spiritual things, which seems really to have existed in Cromwell's character. All his actions, except where he was misled and *excused* by some religious error, were saintly. In short, the—we can scarcely say—*biographer* of this puritan saint, has composed a work which reads marvellously like the legends of his Romish prototypes, and would answer exceedingly well for the devout perusal of “the [Puritan] faithful” on his anniversary.

The author looks upon the rebellion in the reign of Charles I., as a great providential interference for the purpose of saving Europe from the progress of popery; and he evidently intends it to serve the purpose of offering a strong warning against the progress of popery in the present day. We agree in the substance of his lesson, but we cannot feel, with him, that insurrection is to be looked to as the remedy.

“If England desired at the present day (he says), as her princes desired in the seventeenth century, to restore popery; if the number of those unfaithful ministers who abjure the Gospel for the Pope should multiply in her bosom; if that superstitious madness should spread to their congregations; if the heads of the Church should continue to slumber, and, instead of rescuing their flocks, allow them to proceed towards the wolf that is waiting to devour them; if the government, not satisfied with granting liberty to popery, should encourage it still further by endowing its seminaries, paying its priests, building its churches, and restoring throughout Great Britain the powers of the Roman bishop . . . then would England probably be convulsed by



risks; different, it might be, from those which startled the reign of Charles, but not the less formidable. Again the earth would quake; again would it open to pour forth devouring flames. On this account, a study of that remarkable era, in which the first contest took place, is never more necessary than in the present day."—pp. 16, 17.

The beginning of this sentence seems not very consistent with the conclusion. We suppose that if "England" chooses to have popery, she *will* have it, and without any "earthquakes" or "devouring flames." We should be very glad to think that there is so much principle in the country as to offer any opposition which could be so designated. When we see the *Times*, and other influential journals, which invariably follow the direction of the great masses of the community, openly advocate the endowment of Romanism, the abolition of all the securities which have been afforded by law against its encroachments, and a direct communion between the English government and the papal see, we cannot but feel that there is imminent danger of further steps being taken towards the encouragement of popery. And strongly as such things are disapproved by the Church generally, and by those who comprehend the real danger to the community at large, in encouraging the machinations of a power which will never be satisfied till it obtains absolute ascendancy in Church and state, still we fear, that the short-sighted and selfish "liberalism" of politicians, and of those who are either without any religious principles, or are merely influenced by hatred to the Established Church, will gradually break down all the barriers which have been raised against popery in former ages. This is our danger—so far as temporal prospects are concerned. It is in the spirit of "liberalism," of "revolution," with which popery places itself in close alliance, that the most serious dangers of religion, as regards its establishment, resides. But we trust, that as the state withdraws its exclusive support from the cause of truth, the earnestness and energy of its advocates will be increased. We should not look with hope to insurrection or sedition, as we much as that the author of this volume does.

We can draw no other inference than this from the passage above cited, and from the general tone of his book. In every case the conduct of those who rose in insurrection, on religious pretences, against their lawful sovereign, is studiously justified and applauded. The puritans who beheaded their sovereign, are held up to our admiration as the "chosen of the Lord." Their leader is regarded as a chosen vessel of Divine grace. His whole conduct is represented as guided by the most exalted religious principle. He is, in fact, a Christian hero, who had his failings like David himself, but who was nevertheless a model of Christian

holiness. What is this, but to encourage sedition and rebellion for the sake of religion against constituted authorities? We may perhaps condemn much in the conduct of Charles or of Laud, as arbitrary, impolitic, or over-severe, but this is a very different matter from holding up rebels against the royal authority as saints and martyrs. We may find it impossible to condemn very strongly, those who rose in insurrection against King James; we may think that there were circumstances which may, in some degree, extenuate their fault, but this is a very different thing from applauding their conduct and asserting their full right to rise in insurrection against the actual sovereign. Such principles are of a seditious and unscriptural character. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné seems to us to have forgotten altogether in his zeal for Protestantism, that there is such a scriptural duty as obedience to the "powers that be;" that he who "resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." He appears to be an advocate for what has been designated "the sacred right of insurrection." He is throughout, not an historian, but a panegyrist, so that his work is not of much value. He is so evidently biassed by his sympathies with the Protector's position as the defender of Protestantism throughout Europe, that he cannot see any faults in his character. It never occurs to him, that the Protector might have assumed this character not merely from enthusiasm in the cause, but from deeper political motives. The whole of the book is so excessively partial and one-sided, that it is frequently impossible to refrain from a smile at the earnestness of devotion manifested by this most rapturous admirer of "Old Noll."

XIII.—*A Handbook for Visitors to Oxford. Illustrated by one hundred woodcuts.* Oxford: Parker.

WE recommend every one who is about to visit Oxford to procure a copy of this Handbook, which is immeasurably the best guide we have ever seen to the University of Oxford. Indeed, we think that all members of the University, and all who are anxious to refresh their memories of its beauties, could not do better than purchase this volume, which, at a very moderate expense, will place before them all the principal objects of interest in the University in a series of very beautiful woodcuts, accompanied by literary descriptions, of a character far superior to any thing which has yet made its appearance under the title of an Oxford Guide. To the ecclesiologist and the antiquarian the volume will possess a peculiar interest and value. The introduction contains a well-written account of the constitution of the University.

In the woodcuts, one hundred in number, with which this volume is decorated, we recognize many of those beautiful models which are known to the readers of the "Glossary of Architecture," and other architectural books.

XIV.—*The Life and surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner. Written by himself. (A New Edition.)* London: Burns.

THERE is nothing very particular to remark of this new edition of Robinson Crusoe. It is neatly executed, and contains some tolerable wood-engravings. The second part is somewhat abridged by omitting some of those details which young persons are apt to skip over. We do not feel that the principle of making such omissions is a good one: we should rather have the book as it was written by its author.

XV.—*Emily Bathurst; or, at Home and Abroad. By the Author of "A Book for Young Women," "A Book for Wives and Mothers," &c.* London: Wertheim.

THE object of this little work, as stated in the preface, is to meet some of the objections which are constantly urged against undertakings in which every female ought to be interested, and to point out certain defects which are often visible in the social circle. The "undertakings" alluded to are "the Church Missionary Society;" and the "defects" consist in expending a smaller proportion of a young lady's allowance on dress than might fairly be expected by her mamma. The body of the work consists of an account of New Zealand, and of the proceedings of the Church Missionary Society; including an answer to the objections urged against it as a society of questionable Churchmanship; a defence of the missionaries against the imputation of acquiring large tracts of land for their own benefit; a review of the habits, manners, and customs of the New Zealanders, with accounts of Heki, Tippahee, Hongi, Kawiti, &c. We have a history of the origin of the Church Missionary Society, lists of the attendants at Divine worship in New Zealand, and all other information which can be requisite for the purpose of giving a young lady of eighteen, like Miss Bathurst, a full and particular knowledge of all that is doing at the antipodes. The heroine, who makes her appearance at the beginning of the volume, has just completed her education, in the opinion of her governess, but in that of her uncle she has only just entered on it; and he begins to develop her mind by giving her the instructive and

some of the most of New Zealand to which we have  
 been invited. It is not, however, in our opinion, should have been  
 sent in, as it is somewhat difficult to understand. The  
 man of the book is a very good one, and it would have  
 been the more interesting if it had been put forth as a  
 specimen of the *Journal of the Society*, in connection with  
 New Zealand. As it is, we think it will be the work for any  
 thing which could justify the title.

xvi.—*History of the Hottentots*. By CHARLES C. Moberly, B.A.  
 London: Smith.

A collection of notes originally written for the use of a class in  
 the University of Liverpool. The author has not confined  
 himself to the text of Herodotus, but has attempted to clothe  
 his notes in such plain English as that author might be  
 supposed to have used had he written in our language. The  
 peculiarity of style we conceive to be more ingenious than useful,  
 and serves rather to distract the attention than to impress upon  
 the mind of the young reader the chief events of Grecian History.  
 These notes are, however, carefully compiled, and when read with  
 maps, may serve as an introduction to graver studies in ancient  
 history.

xvii.—*The Life of Mrs. Godolphin*. By JOHN EVELYN, Esq.,  
 of Wotton, now first published and edited by SAMUEL, LORD  
 BISHOP OF OXFORD. Chancellor of the most noble Order of the  
 Garter. London: Pickering.

THE simple and beautiful narrative of the Life of Mary Godol-  
 phin, which has so long remained dormant in the exquisitely neat  
 MS. of Mr. Evelyn's handwriting, will be perused with pleasure  
 by many amongst our fair countrywomen, who, in these days of  
 more godly purity, can happily appreciate the exalted course she  
 held at a period when the morals of England were at their lowest  
 ebb, "when, in private life, morality was a reproach, truth de-  
 parted, and religion a jest." The publisher has invested this little  
 work with the same attractions in regard to letter-press and  
 arrangement as that of "the Diary of Lady Willoughby," now so  
 well known from the many eminently beautiful and gentle ideas  
 expressed in it, and whose only drawback is, that it is a fiction.  
 The present work, however, possesses the additional interest  
 of being taken from the original MS., and is presented to the  
 reader unaltered, both in style and orthography, with the excep-  
 tion of such few words inserted in brackets as were necessary

complete the sense; the final corrections never having been made by Mr. Evelyn. In the introduction, so feelingly written by the distinguished editor, the character of Mrs. Godolphin is beautifully described in the following extract. After a quotation from Evelyn's *Diary*, detailing the fearful vice and immorality of the court of Charles II., his lordship says,

“ In the midst of such a general reign of wickedness, it is most refreshing to the wearied spirit to find by closer search some living witnesses for truth and holiness,—some who, through God's grace, passed to his call their vexed days amongst the orgies of that crew as tainted by its evils as is the clear sunbeam by the corruption of a noisome atmosphere. Such a one was Mary Godolphin, whom neither the license of those evil days, nor the scandal and detraction with which they abounded, ever touched in spirit or in reputation. Verily she walked in the flames of “ the fiery furnace and felt no hurt, neither did the smell of fire pass upon her.” In what strength she lived this life, the following pages will declare. They will show that ever by her side, conversing with her spirit through its living faith, there was a fourth form like unto the Son of God. And one thing for our instruction and encouragement may here be specially noted, that in that day of reproach she was the true daughter of the Church of England. Puritanism did not contract her soul into moroseness, nor did she go to Rome to learn the habits of devotion. In the training of our own Church, she found enough of God's teaching to instruct her soul: in its lessons she found a rule of holy self-denying obedience; in its prayers, a practice of devotion; in its body, a fellowship with saints; in its ordinances, a true communion with her God and Saviour; which were able to maintain, in simple, unaffected purity, her faith at court; in dutiful, active love, her married life; which sufficed to crown her hours of bitter anguish, and untimely death, with a joyful resignation and assured waiting for her crown.”—pp. 15—17.

Born in the year 1652, and descended from an ancient and honourable family, she early displayed her extraordinary mental qualifications and earnest sense of religion. She was sent over to France at a tender age, and consigned to the care of the Countess of Guilford, who menaced and unkindly treated her, upon finding that her efforts to induce the child to attend mass were unavailing: but a more serious trial awaited her on her return to England; at the age of twelve years, she was appointed maid of honour to the Duchess of York, and was thus launched into the corrupt and perilous atmosphere of the court: but the greater the danger, the more eminently was her virtue and piety displayed. Beautiful as a young spirit, she went on her way exciting admiration and respect by her gentle piety, her sparkling wit, her judgment, and sound discretion.

" Allwayes in perfect good humour, allwayes humble, religious to exactness, itt rendred her not a whitt moross, tho' sometymes more serious, casting still about how she might continue the houres of publique and private devotion and other excercises of piety to comply with her duty and attendance on her royall misstress, without singularity or reproach."—p. 11.

Her early marriage enabled her to retire from a life in every way contrary to her tastes. Our space will not permit us to dwell upon the very many beautiful expressions and sentiments which her friend Mr. Evelyn has preserved with so much apparent accuracy. Her guileless life was brought early to a close, after giving birth to a son,—an event so hopefully looked forward to by the devoted parents. We trust that many readers may be found for this little work; for whom we cannot do better than desire, in the concluding words of the introduction, that each "may in a better day learn in secret for himself, those lessons of heavenly wisdom which adorned the life, and glorified the death of Mary Godolphin."

xviii.—*The Evangel of Love. Interpreted by* HENRY SUTTON.  
London: Bartlett. 1847.

WE never remember to have been so humbled in our lives before, so completely "taken aback" by consciousness of our own manifest ignorance; so overwhelmed by an apprehension of the stupendous flights to which the human understanding is capable of attaining, as we have been (we frankly confess it) by a perusal of Henry Sutton's interpretation of "The Evangel of Love." Verily, "there are more things in heaven and earth than were dreamt of in *our* philosophy."

First of all, gentle reader, you must know that we rather prided ourselves on our scholarship and dialectical attainments. Conceive, then, the blow which our conceit experienced at the very first brush with Mr. Sutton, when we were met by such words—thick as nails in a banker's door—as *enlovens*, *trinitized*, *soulic*, *bodilic*, *bodysoulic*, and were informed, now for the first time, by way of explanation, that *bodysoul-ic* is synonymous with *psychesome-ic*; that *trine*, or *triune*, or *trinitized*, is equivalent with *converted*, or *regenerated*, or *supernatural*; while *marine* denotes *selfish*, or *sensual*, or *diabolical*, or *carnal*. We were never very fond of the sea; and, after this, it must be questionable whether any Christians will be found henceforth to enter the royal navy.

However, with all our little conceit, we are anxious to learn; and so, nothing daunted, we resolved to persevere. And well for

that we did so ; for a rich feast, and a *rare* one too, lay spread  
ore us. Take a taste or two.

' 13. And all things in nature, belong to one of these three pro-  
ces.

' 14. The mineral (in which term *all* mere gases, fluids, and solids  
included) has an organic truth, strength, beauty, intelligence, life,  
lity, and love of its own. . . . .

' 15. And as the soul is in every particle of nature, it follows that  
re is no particle without soulic intelligence, and vitality, and love,  
well as the rest of the seven souls [i.e. truth, strength, &c.] . . . .

' 16. Every vegetable is a double mineral ; so that its organic num-  
would be 14 rather than 7 ; for each succeeding province of nature  
ludes its predecessor, the vegetable the mineral, and the animal the  
etable. So 2 consists of 1 added to 1 ; and 3 is 1, with 2 added,  
l includes both 1 and 2.

' 17. In the vegetable province, therefore, mineral truth, mineral  
ngth, mineral beauty, mineral intelligence, and vitality and utility  
goodness (for these are the same), and love, exist as completely as  
he mineral itself, the vegetable being a mineral, with an aggrandize-  
nt."—p. 11.

Well, we remember that John Locke said somewhere—we  
ays thought with more wit than truth,—that "all stones,  
tals, and minerals, are real vegetables ; that is, grow organi-  
ly from proper seeds, as well as plants." But here we find that  
mineral, "in which term *all* (!) mere *gases, fluids, and solids* are  
luded" (!!), is a *half-vegetable*, for that "every vegetable is a  
*double* mineral," with nearly twice as many lives as a cat. But  
s is nothing to the succeeding announcement :—

" 18. So also the animal province consists of both its predecessors,  
h an enhancement : . . . for it has vegetable truth, vegetable power,  
etable beauty, vegetable intelligence also, and life, and goodness,  
l love.

" 19. It is therefore wrong to say that an animal is not a vegetable,  
a mineral. . . .

" 20. Now as nature has only these three provinces, it follows that  
n must be either, at his highest, a mere animal, or else supernatural.

" 21. And in fact he is both natural and supernatural ;—natural,  
ause he is a mineral, a vegetable, and an animal ;—supernatural,  
ause he is higher than these."

There is a *Systema Naturæ* for you ; *Mémoires pour servir d*  
*histoire de tout le monde* ! Hear this, Professor Forbes and  
bert Brown ; give ear to this ye members of the Linnean !  
IT IS WRONG TO SAY THAT AN ANIMAL" (AND THEREFORE  
N) "IS NOT A VEGETABLE OR A MINERAL." To be sure it  
VOL. VIII.—NO. XV.—SEPT. 1847. Q



is ! though you have not had the *nous* to discover it : man is a mighty zoophyte—"with an enhancement."

The author is of opinion, touching *angels*, that "the only 'evidence' we have of their fancied existence, is contained in some old pamphlets, written in a superstitious age and country, and proved to be in many parts purely allegorical and poetical."—p. 128.

This is a truly singular mode of designating the books of the Holy Bible ; but perhaps Mr. Sutton never read the Bible. We had almost said we hope not. He is welcome to choose between the two—ignorance or irreverence. We have not before accustomed ourselves to regard *railways* so immediately as the signs and forerunners of the millennium, as this gentleman seems to do.

"Distance has grown grey in his tyranny ; no matter,—his commission now, in great part, must be taken away ; sons, and sisters, and sire, must no more be sundered in affection, and taught to forget to love, at the bidding of a few paltry tens or hundreds of miles ; but, between the particles of the social mass, the noble element of goodwill is to have free commerce, and none may say to it, *what doest thou?* By the extraordinary currency of intellectual and social, as well as political wealth, the extending of marriage ties from villages to provinces, the breaking down of caste, the enlarging of intellect, and then of affection, is the railway to aid in bringing on the reign of goodness."—p. 154.

The following certainly is the most naïve mode of describing the effects of being drunk overnight, that we have met with.

"What have I gained by yesterday's over-happiness, since to-day I must be dull, and can scarce crawl about with any satisfaction ? What I want is, to have every minute sound and good ; and it is poor policy to make to-day rotten, through yesterday's over-delicious ripeness."—p. 189.

But Mr. Sutton is not one of those stoics, whose stern philosophy forswears the softer touches of humanity. He has evidently studied the character of *woman* and *woman's love*, to the same advantage as the other branches of natural philosophy. No fewer than sixty pages are devoted to "love." He has been in love—it is undeniable ; perhaps he is so still, poor man ! Many of his descriptions are quite touching: they would form a very handbook for beginners, teaching them how to

" skip  
From her hand unto her lip ! "

So that, "in some happy moment of unusual confidence," might

" His erewhile timid lips grow bold,  
And poesie with hers in dewy rhyme."

We have understood that M. Soyer likewise was once married,—

happily so, we hope; and yet it is open to a question, whether his connubial affection was quite so æthereal as our author's.

“ But which, do you think, is of the most consequence,—that the mind of the being whom you are bound to love and cherish, should be degraded, diminished, stunted, or that your base appetites should be indulged? Make your wife what it is your duty to make her, I say; and let your pudding burn to cinders, ay, and perish for ever, with all its tribe, rather than that any portion of woman's soul should be lost to her and you! Alas! my friends, we are destroying each other for our bellies' sake. [A strong measure, this!] For messes of pottage, we are selling woman's birthright. We are cramping her mind, and robbing her of some of her noblest progressions [clearly ‘progressions by antagonism,’ my Lord Lindsay], and it is our base appetites that do it all. Were but this abomination of cooking done away, . . . . instead of living in ignorance, and growing old in a round of soul-wasting, insignificant duties, our women would, in a manner, *grow younger* and more glorious *every day*.”

It is possible that this is the very reason why some Benedicks insist upon sitting down to two or three courses daily, for such a catastrophe as that with which Mr. S. threatens their abstemiousness might prove any thing but agreeable: however, we beg to assure him, that *we* have forbidden our wife to spend her mornings elbow-deep in suet and flour.

Our author professes, *inter alia*, to be a bit of a phrenologist; and the following extract (with which we must take our leave of him) demonstrates that he has not manipulated his own skull quite in vain. He writes,

“ It is true, I have naturally a large and carnal development; but how know you that the devils are not all dormant in me,”

[Ah! how indeed?]

“ paralyzed by the grace of God in my soul? It may be true, that my intellectual powers are small—”

Ay, it *may* be, sure enough.

“ It is true, I have but a small natural heavenly endowment; but will your callipers tell you, whether that, small as it is, is not master of me—master of all the other faculties?”—p. 218.

Why, sooth to say, as you ask the question, Mr. Sutton, we must confess, that if *lunar* be related to “heavenly” endowment, we have an inkling that it is master of you; and we sincerely hope that ere long the Lord Chancellor may try what *his* callipers will say to this<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above we regret to say that we have met with two or three expressions of opinion which border so closely upon blasphemy, are so horrifyingly rationalistic, that we sincerely *hope*, as well as believe, that Mr. Sutton is insane.

**XIX.—*Church Melodies.* By VISCOUNT MASSERENE and FERRAND. London: Aylott and Jones.**

THE object of this work will be perceived from the following extracts from its Introduction.

“ Man must walk here in life as in death, each in his *separate melody of soul* ; for ‘ the heart knoweth his own bitterness, and a stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy ; ’ and to whom is this inner life open, save to Him only who ‘ searcheth the heart and trieth the reins ? ’ But though such is the Christian’s teaching here, in order that he may ‘ cease from man,’ and go through ‘ life’s ’ wilderness ‘ leaning on the beloved,’ yet lest he should feel the journey too great for him, being tempted of his flesh to cry, ‘ I, even I, *only* am left,’ the answer of the Lord maketh his solitary heart glad. Yes, ~~He~~ hath the PLENTIFUL (עֲשׂוּרָה *seven* in Hebrew, plentiful, rich), the RICH number left to Him, who have ‘ not bowed the knee unto Baal.’ . . . . The disciples, journeying to Emmaus, talked of all those things which had happened ; so that, in pursuing that strain, (whose first note was struck by the multitude of the heavenly host, even the ‘ glad tidings of great joy, ’) may we not hope that, in our communings together, Jesus Himself will draw near and go with us ? ”

The noble author is, as he informs us, not one “ who rests in times or seasons, nor who would make of *opinions* PRINCIPLES, or of *discipline* INTEGRAL MEMBERS.”

We own that we do not relish the phraseology employed in this work ; and indeed there is in many places a vagueness of expression on doctrinal matters which perhaps harmonizes with the language we allude to.

But still we cannot help expressing our sense of the truly devotional spirit which reigns throughout the volume, and which is unmingled with any controversial tone. The love of Jesus Christ, and the ascription of praise to God for the work of salvation, together with the expression of Christian humility and a desire for holiness, are the predominant subjects. The volume is, on the whole, of a far more pleasing character than we should have anticipated from its preface. It is decidedly the production of a mind trained in a particular school of theology, and the poetry reminds us strongly of the pious effusions of Methodist and Moravian writers. But it is gratifying to see the Sundays and Festivals of the Church made the occasion for the expression of so much religious feeling.

xx.—*Cicero. A Drama. By the Author of Moile's State Trials.*  
London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THIS poem, which extends to a considerable length, comprises some events in the latter part of the life of Cicero, concluding with his philippic against Marc Anthony. The poem seems deficient in dramatic interest; but the versification is good, and the descriptive power is very considerable. Take the following description of a sacrifice as a specimen:—

The pœan soars; the pontiff bathes his hands :  
With radiant train, beneath the base, he stands ;  
Ascends the altar ; hoods him ; prostrate bows ;  
And lifts his arms with offertory vows.  
Now kneels, with solemn gesture, fronting east ;  
Now turns, his palms outstretching o'er the beast :  
Then kneads from golden patins flour and salt ;  
Then sprinkles o'er the offering free from fault :  
The censor swings ; the chalice tastes, outpours ;  
Remounts the altar, and his God adores.  
All silent add their prayers : the consul these,—  
'Sire, whom this host is sacrificed to please,  
So let my foemen give their blood to gush,  
So fall my vengeance, as your axe, to crush!'

The pontiff wheels: each breath is awed, each eye :  
He waves his arm—dread signal! Heaved on high  
The glittering axe has crushed the victim's skull ;  
Down, prone, on knees knocked outward, drops the bull.  
The knife has gashed his throat ; and through the chasm  
His heart's blood pours . . . .  
Radiant, through rows of mitre, pall, and crook,  
With train of priests and flamens, sped to look,  
The pontiff moves to lead the consul nigh :  
He foremost strides, with haughty step and eye,  
Scarce deigns a glance, to scan the omens shown,  
Where perfect works forbade perfection for his own.

The drama closes with a philippic from Cicero against Anthony.

xxi.—*The History and Principles of the Book of Common Prayer practically explained. By the Rev. J. HUDSON, Licentiate of the University of Durham, and Curate of Alston, Cumberland.*  
London: Painter.

A SIMPLE unpretending little volume, which, from its size and price, seems well calculated for circulation in a parish lending

library. It is a perfectly safe book, and gives just that kind of information which is calculated to be useful and interesting to young persons, without leading them to controversial or unprofitable discussions. There is, of course, nothing new in this little volume, which is a compilation from other works.

#### XXII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

THE Charge recently delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Bath and Wells, by the Lord Bishop (Rivingtons), has attracted general and deserved attention, from the firm and impartial spirit in which it discusses the controversies of the day, and the encouragement it affords to act fully up to the requirements of the Church. We are happy to observe in it a deserved tribute of approbation to Archdeacon Brymer, to whom the diocese of Bath and Wells is under so many obligations.—“Educational Statistics and Church Union,” a Visitation Charge, by Archdeacon Hoare, of Winchester (Hatchards), discusses practically the question of Education, and urges the necessity for increased and united exertions on the part of the clergy, to gather in the multitudes of children who are wandering about without any instruction. The apathy of the parents is so great, indeed, that it appears from the Archdeacon's computations that one-third of the children of age for education, are receiving no education at all, another third are educated in the Church schools, and the rest are in various schools not under church management. The number of children in Dissenters' daily schools is not one-tenth of those who are in Church schools. The whole of this Charge is most excellent, and it enters exactly on the topics and in the spirit which are suitable to the position of the writer.

We have perused with interest a sermon by the Hon. and Rev. A. G. Stuart, Rector of Cottesmore (Hatchards), preached at the visitation of the Archdeacon of Northampton. This discourse comprises many valuable remarks on decline in practical religion, which the author attributes to recent controversies. The Rev. J. Ellison, Vicar of Edensor, has published a visitation sermon, on “The Education of the Heart in Childhood” (Hatchards), which eloquently pleads the cause of Christian education. A visitation sermon by the Rev. Charles F. B. Baylay, Rector of Kirkby-on-Bain, entitled “A Christian's Solicitude for the Ark of his Faith,” is written in that sound and healthy tone which is, we firmly believe, almost universal amongst the clergy. We have also to notice a missionary sermon by the Lord Bishop of Madras, preached at Winchester on behalf of the Church Missionary Society (Rivingtons). This is so far satisfactory, as indicating that

the Church Missionary Society must be acting more cordially with the Bishop than the public had reason to suppose from some correspondence published a year or two since. "The Office of the Witness," a visitation sermon by the Rev. C. J. Elliott, Vicar of Inkfield (Rivingtons), contains a strong denunciation of Romanizing tendencies. "Four Sermons" to young persons on Confirmation, by the Rev. W. Elliott, of St. Mark's Church, Milton-terrace (Parker), are ably and clearly written.

We have read with some pain a sermon by the Rev. J. Oldow, Birmingham, entitled "Zeal without Knowledge, as exhibited within the Church of England" (Rivingtons). With every respect for the author's zeal and sound principle, we regret to see congregations excited by attacks on parties within the Church. Such subjects should, we think, be banished at least from the pulpit.

We have received several publications relative to our sister church in America. Amongst these may be mentioned an eloquent address by Bishop Doane, on laying the corner-stone of a new church at Newark, New Jersey; and Bishop Ives's address on a similar occasion at Burlington, New Jersey. The latter discourse contains some very excellent and judicious remarks on the principles of church arrangement, and on the necessity of providing for the poor. A sermon delivered by Bishop Doane on the same interesting occasion—the rebuilding of his church (which is to be a cruciform edifice 136 feet long, in the early English style, with a tower and spire 150 feet high)—is one of remarkable power and eloquence. We have also seen several numbers of "The Missionary," a periodical published at Burlington, New Jersey, which contains much interesting matter regarding the churches of America and England.

Amongst minor publications regarding the Church and her offices, we may notice a well-written tract, "The Cottager's Guide to the Baptismal Font," by the Rev. J. N. Becket, B.A.; "The Church of the Scriptures, and the Duties of the Laity in Relation to it" (Bell), a tract containing much sound principle, against dissent and Romanism; "The Claims of the Church of England; or, Why I may not become a Romanist" (Burns), also a publication of very sound principles and salutary objects; "Catechetical Exercises on the Saints' Days of the English Church," by E. H. Adamson, M.A.,—a useful set of questions; a reprint of "Waterland on Regeneration" (Dublin: McGlashan), edited by the Rev. C. J. Black; "Portions of the Morning and Evening Services of the Liturgy of the Church of England, catechetically explained," by the Rev. Charles Miller, A.B. (Dublin: Curry),—a useful manual for Sunday schools; "The Sick

Man visited," by Spinkes; and "Penitential Reflections for Lent," &c., forming two volumes of Dr. Hook's "Devotional Library;" a "Catechism of the history of the early Church in England and Wales," by Mrs. Robert Sewell (Longmans)—abounding in facts and knowledge, but not always sufficiently separating fable from truth.

Among publications of a more general character, may be noticed, "Rough Rhymes for Country Girls," "Rough Rhymes for Farmers' Boys," by Miss Parrott, intended to be of use to those classes (Wertheim). These are well adapted to their purpose. The "Church of Rome Self-condemned," by the Rev. Pelham Maitland; a vigorous attack on transubstantiation. "Brougham versus Brougham, or the New Poor Law," by Richard Oastler (Cleaver); a pamphlet against the new poor laws by their most indefatigable opponent. The "Pedigree of the Portrait of Prince Charles," painted by Velasquez, 1623 (Reading: Snare); an 8vo volume of 228 pages on this picture now exhibiting. The "Geographical Progress of Empire and Civilization," by the Rev. T. Price (Longmans); comprising a marvellous sort of serpentine line, beginning at Babylon and ending at *Edinburgh*! which the author lays down as the geographical course of civilization. A Lecture on the "Causes of the Irish Famine," by Dr. Hughes, [Romish] Bishop of New York (New York), ascribes the distress of Ireland to the wickedness of the English rule in that country.

"National Education," by David Stow, (Hatchards,) is a pamphlet, which shows considerable knowledge of its subject.

We have received "A Preliminary Discourse on the Principles of the Moral Law," by Horatio Townsend, Esq.; "Popular Papers on Natural History," including a Tract "On Instinct," by Archbishop Whately; "Our Fellow Lodgers," by the Rev. Dr. Walsh; "Zoology and Civilization," by Isaac Butt, Q.C.; and the "Intellectuality of Domestic Animals," by Rev. C. Otway, A.B. These publications must stand over for further notice.

We are happy to perceive that Sharpe's Magazine still successfully endeavours to uphold the character, which it has earned. This periodical deserves support.

"The Churches of Yorkshire" have reached their fourteenth number, which contains details of the Chapels at Ripon, Stainburn, and New Monkton.



## Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

**COLOMBO.—First Visitation of the Bishop.**—The journal of the Bishop of Colombo's first visitation, which was held in the summer of 1846, extended over the northern and eastern provinces, has just been published by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in Nos. 17 & 18 of the series, "Missions to the Heathen." The picture which it gives of the state of our Church in the island of Ceylon is truly afflicting; idle heathenism is everywhere rampant, and while the Romanists, Wesleyans, and the American missionaries have pre-occupied the field on many stations of importance, the Church of England labours under a miserable want both of churches and of ministers. "The state of the Church," says the Bishop, "at almost every place in my diocese, with the exception of Colombo, Kandy, and Trincomalie, is unsatisfactory. At each of these three places there are churches which either have been, or will be, duly consecrated. But at Jaffna, Batticaloa, and Matura, large and populous, and important as these places are, we have no church at all for our own proper use. The buildings which we are admitted by sufferance only are old Dutch churches. These are spacious and substantial erections, of ample area and massive structure, generally cruciform, with a very stunted tower, if it deserve the name at all, and without any other mark externally of ecclesiastical appropriation or design. As public buildings they are maintained by the Government, and we cannot therefore be excluded; but a Presbyterian story holds the right over them, which, by compact at the capture of the island, is held to be inalienable. We are thus in a less favoured position in many places than others who have deviated not a little from the original constitution of the Dutch Church, at the time of its surrender to the English. We ought, I know full well, to be in a far different position; but still I feel persuaded, that in the present state of public opinion in this colony, were the subject now mooted with the Government, it would raise against us a spirit of antagonism, which would be very prejudicial to the Church. If we are to work our way at all on this point I am full of hope, it must be by charity, not controversy; not, indeed, by compromise with any, but forbearance is all; by a quiet, subdued, but active and living energy; the fruits of which must be its fruits, and the praise of which its fruits. I am therefore silent on the subject. I ask no alteration of existing contracts; I seek no alienation of asserted rights. As I find them, I am content to work them. It will be our own fault if they do not work for good. 'Palram qui meruit ferat.' Our influence must

be felt, not forced. Dissent is everywhere prevalent, in some places quite in the ascendant."

The impression made upon his mind by the momentarily recurring evidence of the heathenism with which the land is overspread, the Bishop thus describes: "The marks of idolatry I saw stamped on the foreheads of thousands as we landed; different, indeed, in themselves, according to the custom observed in the worship of different idols, but all speaking in most unmistakeable language the fact of an all-prevailing heathenism. In the south, among the Buddhists, no outward mark is visible; but in the northern half of my diocese, peopled by a race from India, the Indian superstitions prevail—the brand, either crescent-formed or circular, in three parallel lines drawn across the forehead, or triangular meeting in the centre, of white ashes over the dark brow, meets one, and humbles one, at every step."

He adverts in terms which must find an echo in the heart of every English churchman, to the contrast between the conduct of the Dutch and that of the English during their respective occupations of the island. "The whole province of Jaffna was divided into thirty-two parishes by the Dutch, who built a church, a manse, and a school-house in each. Many of these buildings still remain; some in ruins, others appropriated to any use which the local government may authorize. They are witnesses against us. The Dutch did far more for the propagation of a less pure faith than we do for the extension of our own. Were British rule to become, in the changes brought about by the providence of God from year to year, a fact of history to-morrow, no visible impress would be seen of our faith in the whole face of the land. With the Dutch it was different. They conquered, they colonized, often they converted, the people. Everywhere they built schools and churches; everywhere, to this day, in the maritime provinces, we see traces of them. We use them, but we strive not to emulate them. Because they did not all things well, we think and talk about their faults, but little imitate that in which they are clearly imitable. This island has now been under British rule for fifty years, but not a single church has been built to be compared with those of which we see the ruins in some of the rural districts, or those which witness against us in each of their principal military stations."

The proportions in which the different Protestant bodies have established themselves in the island, are thus stated by the Bishop:—"The Americans occupy altogether thirteen different parochial districts, and have about 4000 children under their instruction; the Wesleyans occupy four districts, with above 1100 children in their schools; and the Church-mission three, with about 900 children under their charge. There seems to be an understanding between the different missions that they will not, and practically do not, interfere at all with each other. The parochial division, each having its appropriated buildings for the missionary work, given or sanctioned by the local authorities, clearly defines the boundary."

As president of the school-commission, the Bishop had occasion to

a visit to the schools connected with the Wesleyan establishment Jaffna, which he describes as very extensive and complete, comprising a boarding-school for girls, an institution for elder youths to be trained as catechists and teachers, besides the large day-schools which the Governor's lordship inspected, and about a dozen others in and around the towns of Jaffna and Waunapouny. "I must own," the Bishop confesses, "that it is very humbling to me, on my first visit to so important a district, to find the ground so entirely pre-occupied; to see every side so much done by others, so little by the Church, either in ministerial, missionary, or educational branches of the great work which the Church has been planted of God in the world. It is humiliating, but it must not be disheartening; it is an uphill, but it is holy work, and it must be undertaken in faith and patience, and in trust of a blessing from on high, in proportion to our zeal and steadfastness. In Jaffna I have one colonial chaplain, but no European clergyman; and were it not for the near proximity of the two stations of the Church Missionary Society, I should be altogether without any help or resource before me, but that which God may put into the hearts of you and others to give me. Were it not for the aid of the Church Missionary Society, I should have gone into the northern province of my diocese, with a population of more than 200,000 souls, as an English bishop, without an English clergyman by birth or education to call to my right aid, with heathen temples around on every side, in number countless, of a display most imposing; I have not, nor am I likely to have, a single consecrated place of worship for the members of our communion. How can we call ourselves a missionary Church, when our own are left to be ministered in by others? How can we meet the charge which Rome brings here against us, that we are not a missionary Church? that we have no vitality, no power of expansion or enlargement; that for fifty years the rule of this land has been ours, and we can hardly remember many whom the Church of England has gathered to herself? During the time of the Dutch, it was mentioned to me, they allowed no single heathen temple to be built within their bounds; they allowed no single heathen to enter Jaffna with the stamp of idolatry on his person. In the first year of British rule not less than 300 temples were built in this northern province, and out of every ten natives one now meets, nine can be seen with the mark of heathenism visibly stamped upon the head.

At Jaffna we have no church, no font, no communion-plate; all borrowed for use from the Dutch consistory. There is no consecrated burial-ground, no Church school. In a population of about 100,000 there are eight Romish chapels, and, according to the best information I could gather, about 400 heathen priests. The heathen deities most honoured are Siva, whose chief temple is at Waunapouny, about five miles from Jaffna; Kandiswami, with a large temple near Nellore, almost within the Church mission; and three of Pulliar, whose temples, with their elephant-headed image, are in almost every village, and meet the eye in every direction. The population of the whole district

exceeds 250,000 ; among them there are, including the two missionary stations, three places for public worship, in accordance with the rites of the Church of England, six Wesleyan, eight American, and nearly eighty Romish chapels, three mosques, and seven large heathen temples, besides numberless smaller ones, not only in the villages, but often in situations seemingly out of the reach of all worshippers. There are, besides the colonial chaplain of Jaffna, two Church missionaries, two Wesleyan, seven American, and one Romish bishop with four priests ministering in and around Jaffna."

At an ordination which the Bishop held at Nellore, a native catechist, who had been in the service of the same mission for ten years, presented himself as a candidate for deacon's orders ; but his lordship, though admitting a knowledge of Scripture in the vernacular language, in lieu of the original Greek, and allowing the catechist's answers to be written in Tamul, felt constrained to reject him, on account of the irrelevancy and incoherence of his answers, and the deficiency of knowledge in scriptural and elementary truth, and even of the catechism, which they betrayed. This circumstance, deeply regretted by the Bishop, led him to make, on the existing catechist system generally, observations which, as they throw great light upon the whole position of our Church in that part of the world, and upon the causes of her inefficiency, we here transcribe:—

"Our native catechists require better training than they have ; the Americans manage this matter far better ; their catechists are under continued and systematic instruction. Every week they receive instruction from the missionary under whom they serve, on the subject in which they are to instruct those intrusted to them on the following Sunday. Many advantages accrue from this systematic teaching ; the catechists are not only brought into more direct connexion with the missionary, but their subordination and accountableness are more complete. The subjects of instruction are known, are prepared beforehand ; the catechists themselves are examined in them, have time and notice to think upon them, to prepare themselves from week to week for them, have the guidance and assistance they most need, instead of being left to do and teach only what is right according to their own necessarily defective judgment. It imparts also to their intercourse a more intimate and affectionate character, which must, under the influence of kindly and brotherly feelings, serve to attach them, and, more than this, to elevate their minds to their holy work, and imbue them with a more energetic and devoted spirit. I was much struck, more than once, with the difference of bearing in the American missionaries towards their catechists and our own : they are made more an essential and integral part of the mission, are treated more confidentially, are associated more closely among them, not as persons to work under them but with them ; and the evident result is a greater and more cordial reciprocity of confidence, at the same time with a more entire, because a more humbled and willing dependence. Something of the kind I have adopted since my return with the catechists appointed by

Government, and by your own diocesan committee, in this immediate neighbourhood. My chaplain has voluntarily undertaken the kind office: I could, indeed, wish that he had better materials to work upon, but such as I found, we must strive to improve. It is a wrong system altogether, and I trust in time to work its reformation: the English Government adopted it from the Dutch, and so it has become rooted among us. Qualified and ordained clergymen are my want, not uneducated, and some of them very illiterate, laymen; but they were to be had for 30*l.*, 40*l.*, and 50*l.* per annum, and so were appointed; such as they are, however, we must use, and will try to improve them. My chaplain takes them on every Friday in a class to instruct them, as catechists, in some part of the catechism: this they are themselves to make the subject of the instruction to the children in their schools (some of which I require them all to visit and assist in), taking down the 'Scripture Proofs,' or references from the margin of the Prayer-book. I require them, also, in every Sunday service which they take in the native hamlets around, to catechise the children always, after the second lesson, in those points which have been the subject of their own improvement during the previous week. I propose also to license all catechists who will submit to a preliminary examination in the catechism and Prayer-book, and to admit such only as candidates for holy orders who have been first licensed as catechists. The order, as an order, had sunk so low that something was necessary to be tried to raise it; and I feel persuaded that nothing is so likely to raise it in the estimation of others as to raise the standard of its acquirements."

The inefficiency of the Church system is, however, not the only obstruction to the progress of vital Christianity in the island; the Bishop points out another of a most serious and deplorable character. "One great evil," he says, "in Ceylon, is the prevalence of mere nominal Christianity. Before baptism, little preparation and no discipline is applied. The evils of this laxity are sadly evident. Attendance at the chapel for a single month is received as a sufficient probation for baptism or marriage, of which the natives avail themselves freely; and it very often happens, that having attained this object, they are never more seen in the congregation. The number of relapsed heathens is very great, though it is not often admitted; but multitudes of baptized persons scruple not at all to resort to heathen ceremonies, partake in heathen observances, and, in times of sickness or special trial, have recurred to the very worst of heathen abominations. The Church missionaries and the Americans are far more scrupulous in their admission of professed converts: they subject them to a lengthened probation, and although they may sometimes be deceived by the duplicity of the native character, the instances of relapse from their communion are much less frequent than among the Wesleyans and Romanists."

Notwithstanding all these drawbacks, however, the Bishop is far from considering the field of his labours as a barren one; on the contrary, he speaks in hopeful terms of the waning influence of heathenism, and of the possibility of conciliating those who are walking in the ways

of schism. As regards the former, he says: "Heathenism is continually losing its hold on the native mind in these districts. There are many indications of it. Instead of five hundred, not fifty temples are kept up as they were. The head men desert them; the festivals are unheeded; some of the temples are already in ruins, and the cars are tumbling to pieces. Already Brahma boweth down, and Buddha stoopeth. I was informed that there are not ten shrines maintained in the district around Batticaloa; and that the self-imposed tax, instead of producing, as of old, a thousand bushels of rice, now falls short of a hundred. Assuredly a door is opening, of which I would most gladly and thankfully avail myself. But where are the means?—and where are the men? Where is the singleness of mind and heart to undertake the work?—the earnestness of faith to carry it on? I look around me, and see it not. Dissent has here done every thing, the Church nothing. The Wesleyans found it an unoccupied field, and they entered in to save it,—in their own way, of course; but well have they done the work; theirs, only because it has been left undone by ourselves."

And further on, he adds: "There is not, I trust, any hostile feeling towards the Church; certainly I saw none. By pursuing, therefore, a quiet, even, and inaggressive course, we may regain something of what has been lost, and provoke no counteracting or hostile spirit. They are all Wesleyans, not from choice, but necessity; and the government agent assured me, that if his attachment to the Church was gone, it was his misfortune rather than his fault. From the day on which he came there, he was made to feel how little the Church cared for its own, and therefore he gave himself to those who were willing to give him what he most needed. Of such it may surely be hoped, that 'they who are not against us are for us.' Many and many are lost to us in the colonies, in the same way. I am far less afraid of the enmity from without, and the treachery and disloyalty from within, than of the apathy and indifference of too many hearts to the newly-awakened sense of the responsibility of our national Church."

FRANCE.—*Budget of the Roman Catholic Establishment.*—An addition of 1,075,000 francs has been made to the budget of the Roman Catholic Church in France, of which the sum of 800,000 francs is intended solely for the increase of the stipends of the parochial clergy. With regard to their position, the report of the committee of the Chamber of Deputies observes: "It is an undeniable fact that the position of the inferior clergy, *i. e.* of the curates of the *succursales* (or dependent district churches), with regard to the stipend allotted to them by the state, is no longer adequate to the common necessities of life. It is, moreover, universally acknowledged, that independently of the privations which such a state of things imposes upon them, the character of the office with which they are invested may suffer by it, and be depreciated, partly through the means to which they may at times be forced to have recourse to satisfy the most imperious wants of nature, partly by the loss of the salutary influence which they may exercise in furtherance of



the objects of their sacred ministry, even by trifling alms, and the slightest assistance seasonably afforded in cases of distress with which they alone are acquainted. These are the different considerations which have for a long time past suggested themselves to your finance committees, and indited the language of their reports, and the repeated recommendations contained in them on the subject of the clergy. These are the weighty reasons which have caused so many petitions for an increase in the stipends of the curates of the *succursales* to be referred by both chambers to the Minister of Worship. The government, therefore, we repeat it, is in this matter only fulfilling a duty; it satisfies a real want, the urgency of which it has felt, and responds to a wish often expressed by the chambers." The report then enters into the details of the proposed increase, which is appropriated according to the age of the curates in the following manner:—

About 975 curates of 70 years and upwards, receiving at present 1000fr. each, to be raised to 1100fr. . . . .	97,500fr.
About 1100 curates from 60 to 70 years old, receiving 900fr. each, to be raised to 1000fr. . . . .	110,000fr.
There remain 26,977 curates under 60 years of age, receiving 800fr. each, of which 6634 have attained, or in the course of the year 1848 will attain, the age of 50; these to be raised 100fr. each; the sum required, making allowance for fractional periods and avoidances, being estimated at . . . . .	592,500fr.
Total	800,000fr.

Besides this, there are to be 300 new districts created; which, at the rate of 800fr. for each curate, amounts to a further expenditure of 240,000fr. The necessity of this increase the committee demonstrates by the following statistical data. There are at present unprovided for:

Populations of 1000 souls and upwards—	
Concentrated . . . . . 37	} . . . . . 140
Scattered . . . . . 103	
Populations under 1000 and above 500 souls—	
Concentrated . . . . . 186	} . . . . . 527
Scattered . . . . . 341	
Populations under 500 souls—	
Concentrated . . . . . 1278	} . . . . . 2537
Scattered . . . . . 1259	
Estimated want in the two departments of la Seine and la Vienne, the statistics of which had not arrived . . . . .	46
Total	3250

of which the government proposes to make provision for 300 in 1847, and for 300 more in 1848.

The last increase proposed is for 100 additional assistant curates, at



350fr. each, in poor and scattered districts; the total number of assistant curates, attached to 29,352 district churches, being only 6786.

In connexion with this subject, the report gives the following table, to show that the supply of clergymen keeps pace with the increased provision of the state, and that the number of cases in which two churches are served by one curate is constantly on the decrease:

In 1820, out of 26,160 district churches, were vacant	3393
„ 1825 „ 26,408 „ „	3464
„ 1830 „ 26,773 „ „	2540
„ 1835 „ 26,775 „ „	1508
„ 1840 „ 27,300 „ „	1307
„ 1845 „ 28,501 „ „	1430

These figures show at the same time the progress which the government of Louis Philippe has made in the extension of the Roman Catholic establishment. During the first five years the increase amounts to nothing; during the second five years it is represented by the figure 525; during the last five years by the figure 1200; being about four times the average ratio of increase during the ten last years of the period of the restoration.

The sum total of the charges for ecclesiastical (Roman

Catholic) stipends in the budget of 1847, is . . .	30,635,000fr.
For the chapter royal of St. Denis . . . . .	112,000fr.
Scholarships in the ecclesiastical seminaries . . . . .	1,000,000fr.
Pensions to ecclesiastics and nuns . . . . .	880,000fr.
Furniture of episcopal residences . . . . .	140,000fr.
Assistance rendered to cathedrals . . . . .	30,000fr.
Maintenance, purchase, erection, and repairs of cathedrals, episcopal residences, and seminaries . . . . .	2,000,000fr.
State contributions towards the purchase or erection of churches and parsonage-houses . . . . .	1,500,000fr.

Sum total of the Roman Catholic budget . . . . . 36,297,000fr.

It must be borne in mind, however, that this amount represents only the direct expenditure from the central treasury of the state for the support of the Roman Catholic establishment, and does not comprise the sums appropriated for the support both of the buildings and the ministers from the local funds, nor the sums received by the clergy under the head of *casuel* and surplice fees, and for the hire of chairs in the churches, nor those obtained by various other methods adopted by the Romish clergy for laying the people under contribution.

*Educational Statistics*.—The following data are taken from the report of M. Liadières to the Chamber of Deputies on the *projet de loi* respecting secondary instruction, which stands over for the ensuing session. The different institutions existing in France for imparting secondary instruction, as it is called,—that is, the higher scale of education,—are, the royal colleges, or public schools of royal foundation; the communal

colleges, or public schools supported by local funds; private institutions conforming themselves to the regulations of the colleges in regard to the number and qualifications of the masters and the subjects taught, whose pupils are admissible to the college examinations for their degrees; and simple boarding-schools. Of these different establishments there are at present in France :

Royal colleges . . . . .	52
Communal colleges, first class . . . . .	160
—————, second class . . . . .	153
Exceptional colleges (Stanislas and Rollin) . . . . .	2
Institutions on the complete college scale, kept by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics . . . . .	22
The same, by Protestant ministers . . . . .	2
The same, by laymen . . . . .	2
Institutions of a lower grade in places where there is a college, kept by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics . . . . .	4
The same, by laymen . . . . .	46
The same, in places where there is no college, kept by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics . . . . .	12
The same, by laymen . . . . .	14
Boarding-schools in places where there is a college, kept by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics . . . . .	32
The same, by laymen . . . . .	393
The same, in places where there is no college, by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics . . . . .	60
The same, by laymen . . . . .	385
Institutions authorized to teach rhetoric, kept by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics . . . . .	3
The same, by laymen . . . . .	5
Ecclesiastic seminaries ( <i>petits séminaires</i> ) . . . . .	125
Auxiliaries to the seminaries . . . . .	55

Making a total of 1527 establishments for secondary instruction. The number of pupils in these different establishments is thus stated :

In the royal colleges (exclusive of the scholars of institutions and boarding-schools who hear college lectures) . . . . .	17,850
In the communal colleges (exclusive again of the scholars of institutions and boarding-schools) . . . . .	28,000
In the two exceptional colleges . . . . .	727
In the 26 institutions on the complete college scale . . . . .	3346
In the 8 institutions licensed to teach rhetoric . . . . .	722
In the 76 institutions of a lower grade . . . . .	5413
In the 870 boarding-schools . . . . .	30,509
In the secondary ecclesiastic seminaries . . . . .	18,238
In their auxiliary establishments . . . . .	727

Making a total of 105,532 boys and youths receiving secondary instruction, without counting those that are educated at home. The propor-

tion of candidates for the bachelor's degree, admitted and rejected in the year 1846, is as follows:

From royal colleges, out of 3354 candidates 1804 were admitted.			
„ communal colleges	1808	„ 850	„
„ institutions	416	„ 232	„
<hr/>			
In all	5578	„ 2886	„

the comparative proportions being, from royal colleges 54 per cent.; from communal colleges 47 per cent.; from institutions 56 per cent.; on the whole 52 per cent.

GERMANY.—*Limitation of Political Rights by Religious Tests.*—During the late session of the Prussian diet, two important questions as to the religious qualifications required for the exercise of certain political rights came under discussion; and as one of them will probably at no distant period form the subject of deliberation in our own legislature, while the recent settlement of the other has been productive to us of no small degree of embarrassment, a short account of the conflict of similar principles and opinions elsewhere will not be read without interest. A petition having been presented by a member of the lower house, whose object was to procure the total abolition of religious tests of any kind in the exercise of political rights, especially the right of sitting in legislative assemblies; and the alteration of certain laws at present in force, in conformity with that principle, the committee to which the petition was referred made a report to the house to the following effect:—1. That a majority of fourteen against two had decided against the unchristianizing of the legislative bodies of the Prussian state; 2. That as the present law,—according to the interpretation put upon it by the government, one of the deputies having been refused admission on the ground of his belonging to the sect of the German Catholics,—made communion with one of the established or recognised Churches a qualification of membership in the diet, a majority, again of fourteen against two, decided in favour of the admission of all Christians, to whatever sect or denomination they might belong, on the ground that it was impossible for the diet to enter into the theological questions necessary to determine whether any given sect, calling itself Christian, had a right to assume that name. When the report of the committee came before the house for discussion, one of the first speakers, a druggist, gave it as his opinion, that “the author of the Christian religion had not founded any Church, the idea of a Church being unknown to the first centuries. Nevertheless,” he said, “a Church did spring up through the prosecution of hierarchical and political purposes. The Reformation paved the way for restoring the autonomy of the Christian congregations agreeably to the intention of their author. According to the general law of the land, the mythic notion of a Church is foreign to our legislation, even in reference to Protestantism; it recognizes only independent Protestant communities, and decidedly asserts their auto-

my. It does not recognize the notion of a national Evangelic Church, a state religion, which the ministry has of late been endeavouring ictly to enforce and to introduce ; a course which can only give rise to spirit of persecution against opponents, lead to violations of the rights conscience, and tempt weak-minded persons to hypocrisy. . . .

the author of Christianity founded no Church ; his doctrine consisted pointing out the love of God and our neighbour as the sum of the ivine commandments, and making that the test of discipleship. . . .

accordance with the requirements of the state, and the doctrines of e author of the Christian religion, the German Catholics, or Catholic issenters, inculcate reverence towards the Deity, obedience to the ws, fidelity to the state, and sentiments of morality and kindness wards their fellow-citizens." In pursuance of these views, the speaker esed for the immediate admission of German Catholics into the embley ; a proposition which was warmly seconded. One of its pporters alleged as his reason for doing so, that " in his opinion the umbers of the diet were not divines, but representatives of the spirit the people." Another, also a druggist, maintained that " if a man ould be chosen whose religious opinions differed from those of his nstituents, it would be all the more to his credit that he was chosen withstanding ; for which reason the most honourable of all elections ould be that of a Jew by a Christian constituency, who would in that se occupy a position anything but inferior to that of other deputies."

Another deputy, Mr. Von Beckerath, a banker of Crefeld, denied the pos- ibility of any recognition of religious principles by the state. " It is the usiness of the state," he said, " to realize the idea of right. Accordingly, e data on which legislation must proceed are not subjective opinions, but ffective facts, to be ascertained only by reference to certain outward iteria, that is, the external relations and actions of life, and in no case ntiments, least of all religious convictions. Religious conviction, the lation of man to his Creator, is a thing altogether beyond the sphere the state ; it is a sacred privilege of the individual, the innermost ret of the soul, which no mortal eye can penetrate, and no human le can measure. But the state is not only to realize the idea of right, is also to represent the form in which a given nation progresses wards the universal destination of humanity. The idea of humanity, erefore, is the highest idea of the state. But how can the violation of e dignity of man in a single individual be reconciled with the idea of anity,—such a violation as is involved in the exclusion from poli- al rights of a portion of the members of the state, not because they t in opposition to the purpose of the state, but because on subjects ick lie beyond the sphere of the state they have formed for them- lves a persuasion which does not correspond with the persuasion of e majority of the citizens, or with the persuasion patronized in the te ? . . . The Christian character of the state depends not on a fession of faith, but on the spirit of Christianity. But the spirit of ristianity is no other than the spirit of pure humanity,—the spirit of re and of freedom. The true Christian state is that which in all its

ordinances and institutions exhibits that spirit, and gives it scope for free development in every direction: but that state does not deserve to be called a Christian state, which seeks to shut up that spirit within confessional boundaries, and upon this narrow foundation deems it justifiable to make political rights dependent on religious profession."

These and other like arguments were combated by the Minister, Mr. Von Eichmann, who contended, that however easy it might be in theory, it was not possible in practice, to exclude religious considerations from all those matters which fell properly under the cognizance of the state; and adduced, as an instance, the question of education, which could not be efficiently conducted without religious instruction and influence. Hence he inferred the necessity of drawing the line somewhere; the state, he acknowledged, was unable to define what was, and what was not, truly Christian: that point must be referred to the existing Christian communities, whose opinion on the subject, if it were not too exclusive, the state was bound to take for its guide. After labouring for some time to extricate himself from the difficulty involved in determining how the line is to be drawn between what is, and what is not, Christian, the Minister appealed to the feelings of the diet, by asking what impression would be produced out of doors, if it should turn out that the very first diet assembled in Prussia declared it a matter of indifference whether its members were Christians or no. Many other speakers followed on both sides of the question, among whom Counts Von Gneisenau and Von Finkenstein particularly distinguished themselves in contending for the exclusively Christian character of the political institutions of a Christian country, and for the necessity of a definite and tangible test for distinguishing what is, from what is not, Christian. "I think," said the latter, "the honourable speakers on the other side will agree with me, that every state must be intelligent and moral, that intelligence and morality must be the elements of its existence. They will further agree with me, that God is the fountain of all intelligence and of all morality. Thus far we agree; but at this point we separate. They believe that intelligence and morality may be developed in dependence on an indefinite idea of the Deity, such as every man may happen to form for himself; I, on the contrary, and not I only, but with me, I contend, a large, and by no means the worst proportion of our true old German nation, are of opinion, that we and this whole state of Prussia can and must serve, exclusively, either the living God who has revealed Himself unto us, or else a false idol, be its name what it may. And this persuasion is to my mind decisive as to the question that our state must be a Christian state. . . . A great deal has been said about liberty of conscience; and on this point also I have a decided opinion, altogether at variance with what has been advanced. Liberty of conscience, in my opinion, is, first of all, the liberty which every individual has of serving his God by himself, according to the best of his own inward persuasion; secondly, the liberty of uniting himself to that Christian community which is in accordance with his own faith. This liberty of conscience has never been interfered with in the Prussian

ate; nor is it interfered with now; for no man, not even the clergyman on entering upon his office, is asked the positive question: 'What do you believe?' All that is required of him is, that he should faithfully discharge his duties. This, therefore, is one part of the liberty of conscience. The other part consists in this, that each is permitted to serve his God in fellowship with those of a like faith with himself. If hereupon individuals or whole communities separate themselves from this fellowship of faith, which is in fact the Church; if they publicly proclaim and confess, 'we forsake this faith of our fathers, and we believe in abstractions, in love, in virtue,' in fact, in things which, while no rational person can call them in question, cannot in their abstraction become objects of faith, truth in its turn requires the acknowledgment, that such persons are not members of our Christian Church, that they cannot be legislators, nor take a part in determining the spirit, the discipline, and the order which shall reign in our Christian community. For which reason I not only give my decided vote for the maintenance of that clause of our laws by which the fellowship of the Christian Church is upheld, but I feel bound loudly, not before the diet only, but openly before the whole German public, to express my deep conviction, that if this clause be struck out, the foundation-stone of our state and of our representative constitution will be taken away, and the whole edifice must ultimately fall into ruins."

The debate, of which this is but an exceedingly brief outline, lasted ten days; at the close of it, the proposal, that the right of sitting in legislative assemblies should be independent of all religious confessions of faith, was negatived by a majority of 319 against 158; and the proposal, that the right of sitting in legislative assemblies should be conceded to all who profess the Christian religion, was, without nominal appeal, affirmed by a majority of more than two-thirds. The question was thus settled with the utmost latitude of interpretation, as to what constitutes a man a Christian; but the name of Christianity was retained, to the exclusion of every other, and specifically the Jewish persuasion, as an indispensable qualification for a seat in the legislature.

When the result of this debate was brought before the house of peers in the form of an address to the king, that he would cause the necessary alteration of the law to be proposed at the next meeting of the diet, a protracted debate ensued there also, in the course of which it was distinctly stated by the minister, that although according to the strict letter of the law, members of the two established Churches, the Roman Catholic and the Evangelic, were alone entitled to sit in legislative assemblies, yet, *de facto*, the government had admitted the members of regularly constituted and publicly recognized dissenting bodies, such as the Mennonites, the Moravians, the Bohemian Brethren, and the Old Lutherans; in fact, of those dissenting bodies, the functions of whose ministers were attended with legal validity, and whose members were consequently enabled to prove, by the very fact of their membership, their right to the Christian name. By this explanation the ques-

and the refusal to be so duped, viz. whether the Neo-Catholics and Non-Protestants the adherents of all the positive doctrines of Christianity, were to be admitted upon their sincere allegation that they were Christians. In illustration of the inconsistency of admitting them, Prince Eugene Ratin<sup>o</sup> mentioned the case of a baptism which took place recently in the immediate neighbourhood of Berlin, when to the question, "Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God?" two of the persons answered distinctly, "No;" notwithstanding which, these persons, and the sect to which they belonged, the *Neo-Catholics*, claimed to be Christians.

Ultimately the proposition of the lower house was passed in the upper house also, by a majority of two-thirds, upon a nominal appeal to the members. It had, however, a narrow escape of being thrown out, first, because one of the members who meant to have voted against it, voted for it by a mere slip of the tongue, which he was not suffered to recall; and in the next place, because a majority of two-thirds being required, there were, out of 56 members, only 37 for, and 19 against it; the casting vote of the president being added to the majority. It is a significant fact, that the names of the parties, with the record of their votes, were published by the upper house, while in the lower house, the more popular assembly, the proposal to publish the division list was decidedly rejected by a large majority.

**INDIA.—British Support of Idolatry.**—The following history of the support given to idolatry by the British government at the temple of Jugganath, taken from the journal of the Bishop of Madras, will be read with interest by those who are anxious for the removal of this reproach to our Christian profession:—

"It is well known that the Pilgrim-tax was abolished by the British Government in 1840: since its abolition, it does not appear that any official record has been kept of the number of pilgrims; but the statement on this head, which I have already given<sup>a</sup>, may, I believe, be depended upon. The rate of mortality among the pilgrims, as stated from time to time in various publications, is, however, greatly exaggerated. The number of pilgrims and of deaths among them, during the Rath festival of 1843, is asserted to have been considerably above the usual average; and the latter did not exceed seven hundred. But surely this is sufficiently shocking; and I am persuaded that, if an accurate account could be kept, and were published, of the number of lives sacrificed yearly to the barbarous and absurd superstition of pilgrimages to the various places held holy by the Hindoos, we should be startled and horrified at the amount of these self-immolated victims.

"The tax being now happily abrogated from which we derived for many years a polluted revenue, the only question still to be adjusted is, whether the British Government is bound by any treaty, or any

<sup>a</sup> The statement here referred to is, that "latterly the concourse of visitors has varied from eighty thousand to one hundred thousand; seventy-five per cent. of whom, it is calculated, are women."



moral obligation, to continue in perpetuity the donation still granted towards the support of the temple of Jugganath. It appears that the tax existed since the seventeenth century, and was imposed therefore by the Moguls, and continued by the Mahrattas; and there is reason to conclude that the religious warfare carried on between the Hindoos and Moguls, during the early times of the government of the latter, was at last set at rest by the institution of this tax. But the money-payment or donation was granted by the Mahrattas, who made themselves masters of Orissa, between the years 1743 and 1755. When the British took possession of the province in 1803, they allowed things to remain as they found them. An alleged deficiency in the assets for the maintenance of the temple (an amount varying every year) had been paid by the Mahrattas, and was therefore continued by the British. It seems, however, to be quite contrary to fact, that any engagement to make these payments in perpetuity was ever entered into by the British Government: the circumstance of the officers of the temple being unable to produce proof of any such engagement, and of the absence of all historical or official record of any, constitute evidence in favour of this opinion, which cannot be easily set aside.

"It is, indeed, asserted by the Brahmins, that a pledge for its continuance was given by Colonel Harcourt, who commanded the British forces when they took possession of Jugganath; but they have no document to produce in evidence of this asserted compact; and the fair and reasonable inference is, that that officer simply gave them a general assurance that they should not be molested in the exercise of their religion. Nevertheless, from a careful consideration of such facts as I have been able to acquaint myself with, I am led to the conclusion, that an engagement to pay the donation is *implied* by the Governor-General having from time to time sanctioned such payment; and, therefore, that the British Government would not now be morally justified in withholding the donation, without giving the natives an equivalent. And I think it equally clear, that, for the honour of the Christian name in India, the sooner this is done the better. It is evident, that the payment of an annual sum by the Government, towards the maintenance of the temple, *must be interpreted by the people as a government-support of their idolatry*; and as it seems equally evident that the government cannot honourably repudiate a claim, which it has recognised, *in point of fact*, since the British took possession of the place, it is surely its duty, on the principles of good faith and integrity, to make over lands of sufficient value to cover the average amount of the donation hitherto made; and then to declare that, while it thus conscientiously fulfils what appears to have been recognised by itself, (or, rather, what it had led the natives to conclude that it had recognised,) as a political engagement, it makes this new and final arrangement, because a Christian government can no longer submit to even the appearance of contributing funds to the support of an idolatrous worship.

"This, as it seems to me, would in future fully exculpate Great

Britain from all supposed countenance of the horrible idolatry of Juganath; an imputation which ought never to be allowed to cleave to a Christian government, when capable of removal."

Whether the permanent endowment of idolatry is preferable to an annual donation in support of it, is a question on which we shall not venture to offer an opinion. But we cannot forbear to add, that if a punctilious sense of honour is thought to require the continuation of a payment so utterly inconsistent with the Christian character of the mother country, there is assuredly a much higher obligation resting on that country to bestow ten times, and, if need be, a thousand times the amount upon the diffusion of the Gospel in the land in which an adulterous countenance has so long been given to idolatry. To do this upon a scale proportionate to the wealth of Great Britain, and so to chase away idolatry by the light of Christian truth, would be at once the most effectual way to get rid of the difficulties arising from the alleged engagement, and the best proof that could be given to the people of India, that the objection made to the "donation" is not a question of money, but a question of faith.

ITALY.—*Ecclesiastical policy of Pius IX.*—In the midst of the political agitations and complications by which the attention of Europe is at this moment concentrated upon the movements of the papal government, it is evident that Pius IX. has never for a moment lost sight of the one great and unbending purpose of the flexible policy of the Roman court—the restoration of papal supremacy. For the attainment of this purpose, he has conceived the bold plan of discarding the conservative notions of the old *régime*, and enlisting the democratic tendencies of the age in the service of spiritual despotism. This is equally apparent in the position which he has taken up at home as the liberator of Italy, and in the attitude which he has assumed towards France and the dynasty of Louis Philippe on the one hand, and towards the revolutionary party in Ireland on the other hand. The emphatic language of paternal solicitude in which his encyclic on behalf of the starving Irish was penned, was hardly consistent with the fact, nowhere recognized in that document, that there is a government in existence to take care of Ireland; a government which, at that very moment, was making unparalleled efforts to alleviate, as far as human power and wealth could do so, the sufferings of the Irish people. Still more significant, as to the countenance given by the papacy to the cause of Irish agitation and rebellion against a "heretical" government, were the demonstrations made at Rome on the occasion of O'Connell's death. In the fulsome eulogy pronounced from the pulpit on the deceased agitator, Father Ventura distinctly adopted the principles on which his political career was founded. He described him as "that great citizen and eminent Christian who had employed religion for the conquest of liberty, and liberty for the triumph of religion; who had succeeded in establishing those two great principles, by which, according to the doctrine of St. Paul (*sic!*), a Catholic nation is to reconquer its rights, and

to shake off the yoke of servitude,—namely, passive resistance and active obedience.”

While this is the tone in which a system of sedition and treason, aiming at no less than the dismemberment of the British empire, and the overthrow of institutions guaranteed by express and solemn compact, is lauded to the skies at Rome, France is officiously courted, and pointed out as the power which is “destined to stand in Europe at the head of Catholicism.” Two French prelates, the archbishops of Cambrai and of Bourges, were, at the request of Louis Philippe, lately raised to the cardinal dignity, on which occasion Pius IX., in his allocution to the consistory, thus expressed himself: “We take exceeding great pleasure in complying, by this investiture of two French Bishops, with the wish of our dearly beloved son in Christ, Louis Philippe, the most Christian king of the French, who has greatly commended them to us, and has informed us by letter how much he would be gratified by their promotion, to the end that all men may see how highly we appreciate the good will of that most excellent king, and how desirous we are of obliging him. Besides, we are delighted to have this opportunity afforded us of giving this open and public proof of our affectionate attachment to our venerable brethren, the Bishops of that renowned, and, by us, so much beloved nation, out of whose number these have been chosen for so high a dignity. For nothing is, to our mind, more important or desirable, than that we should attach the Bishops of France to our person, and to this Apostolic see, by daily closer ties, in order that they may, as good soldiers of Christ Jesus, with the greater alacrity continue fearlessly, with all episcopal constancy, prudence, and patience, to defend, as they are already doing, the doctrine, the rights, and the liberty of the Catholic Church, and to fight the good fight. As for ourselves, being, as becometh our office of the supreme apostolate, deeply solicitous for the welfare of all the Lord’s flock committed to us by God, we shall, as on the one hand, never fail to inculcate upon all the duty of rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, so on the other hand, never cease with apostolic freedom to lift up our voice, commanding all to render unto God the things that are God’s.”

While the latter part of this sentence implies the determination steadily to assert and maintain the spiritual pretensions which constitute the essence of popery, it must not be forgotten that the “Cæsar” whose special favour Pius IX. is desirous of conciliating, and whom he designates as the “most Christian king,” is the king of the revolution, who wears his crown “by the will of the people,” in pointed contradistinction to the ancient tenure, “by the grace of God.” But if any doubt could remain as to the projected alliance between the papacy and the principle of democracy, it must disappear before the following passages of Father Ventura’s *Elogio Funebre di Daniello O’Connell*, which may be considered as a demi-official programme of the ecclesiastical policy of Pius IX.

“The time of illusions is gone by. While those prejudices and sad errors, the result of a combination of unfortunate circumstances, are suffered to continue, according to which the Church is considered as the confederate

and accessory of the excess and abuse of power, it will be idle for us, servants of the true faith, to hope that we shall gather the intelligent masses around us; they will always look upon us with a species of horror; they will continue to walk without us, and if we do not head them, they will go against us and over us. Nay, I will go further and say, that if a movement of rebellion should take place in Italy, under the influence of those prejudices and errors, it would prove to the last degree an anti-Christian and anti-Church movement. The cry, 'Down with the clergy, down with the monks,' would be carried literally into effect, with a truth which it makes one shudder to think of. The Church would be exposed to greater horrors than those of which, at the beginning of this century, she was made the victim."

What the principle of legitimacy, and the conservative governments of Europe have henceforward to expect at the hands of the papacy, is left in no manner of obscurity. "Woe," says Father Ventura in another part of his discourse, "woe to the governments which imagine that religious despotism is practicable in the nineteenth century, after the great revolution which the ideas of mankind have undergone. The emperors who, after embracing Christianity, refused to comprehend Christianity, who dared to continue a system of pagan despotism over the Church, were left in the lurch by the Church; they sunk down to that low level which has procured for the records of their reigns the title, 'History of the Low Empire,' and they vanished from the political stage without heirs and without successors. The Church, which despises none, but seeks all, whose business it is not to cast away, but to gather, and to sanctify whatever has power and life, then turned to the barbarians whose hands had executed justice upon the baseness and blood-guiltiness of the Roman empire; she washed their hands with a little water, she anointed their foreheads with a little oil, and so accomplished the miracle of a Christian monarchy. If ever, therefore, their successors, surrendering themselves to the action of the pagan and essentially despotic element, should renounce the Christian element whose essence is freedom and love, and the doctrine of the religious liberty of the nations and the independence of the Church, the Church will be able to do without them; she will, perchance, turn towards the democracy, baptize that wild matron, Christianize her, as she formerly Christianized the barbarian; she will acknowledge one and another of her sons, whom events have raised to the throne, set upon his forehead the mark of divine consecration, and say to him, 'Rule thou;' and he will rule, in spite of his plebeian origin. For there is no other stay, or salvation, or defence, or chance of duration for any government, except by giving to the Church her freedom, and by treating the nations, and respecting them, as the sons of God."

To carry out this determination to head the democratic movement of the nineteenth century, in the hope of turning it to account for the restoration and consolidation of the papal supremacy, Pius IX. is well aware that the papacy will have need of strict discipline and unity of action in the ranks of her hierarchy. Accordingly he has announced

his intention of proceeding upon an entirely new system of ecclesiastical promotion. "Desiring to advance," he says, in the allocution already quoted, "the honour and splendour of your order, and resolved upon carrying out the wise and prudent provisions contained in the solemn words and decrees especially of the council of Trent (Sess. xxiv. c. i. De Reform.), on the election of bishops and cardinals of the holy Roman Church, we are determined to confer ecclesiastical dignities and the sacred purple, not upon those who shall be recommended by the station and custom of the office which they may occupy, but upon such excellent persons distinguished for their piety, integrity, and learning, and by every virtue, as shall by glorious achievements and constant labours have rendered the greatest services to the Catholic Church, and to this apostolic see." Another indication of the spirit in which his ecclesiastical administration is to be conducted, is the appointment of a special congregation of cardinals for the superintendence of the monastic orders; and the issue of two encyclics, one addressed to all superiors, abbots, provincials, and other heads of religious orders, informing them of his intention to restore monastic discipline, and calling upon them to promote within their respective bodies unity of spirit and of purpose with the Roman Church; the other, to all archbishops and bishops, inviting them to co-operate with him in this reformation, and to put themselves for this purpose in communication with the newly-appointed congregation. Several changes in the occupation and government of the religious houses in Rome itself have already taken place, in practical illustration of the principles set forth in these two encyclics.

Meanwhile the order that appears to enjoy in a peculiar degree the confidence and affection of Pius IX., is the order of Jesuits. As a mark of this his especial favour, he announced his intention of administering the holy communion with his own hands to the pupils of the Roman college on the feast of St. Louis de Gonzague. The preparations made in the college for his reception were of the most gorgeous description; such as to excite beforehand the envy and jealousy of the less favoured communities. The *Ami de la Religion*, which gives a long and pompous description of the whole festivity, asserts that attempts were made to dissuade the pope from carrying this intention into effect, on the plea that so signal a mark of his favour might provoke irritation among their enemies. The pope, however, sent for the rector of the college, whom he assured that he should pay his promised visit, in spite of the opposition made to it, on the Sunday within the octave of the feast. As the number of pupils (eleven hundred) was too large for the pope to administer the communion to them all, it was arranged that three hundred of them should have this privilege, and these three hundred were accordingly chosen by lot. The wheel of fortune, in remarkable accordance with the views of his holiness, threw up the names of the only four Frenchmen in the college among the fortunate number of those who were thus to

receive the holy communion by lottery<sup>1</sup>. To the remainder the sacrament was administered by two bishops. The religious ceremony was followed by the presentation of prize-essays, as specimens of the progress of the pupils, recitations, gratulatory hymns and sonnets, addressed to Pius IX., and other festivities; all calculated to give the greatest possible *éclat* to the occasion, to set the perfect good understanding which reigns between the pope and the order in the clearest possible light, and to show that the Jesuits enter heart and soul into the new ecclesiastical system of the pontiff.

*Project of a General Council, and comprehension of the Greek Church.*—The idea of a General Council to be convened by Pius IX., appears still to be current at Rome, and, according to the correspondent of the *Rappel*, it is intended to include learned men from every fraction of Christendom. It is asserted, that during the visit paid by the Emperor Nicolas to Gregory XVI., this subject was mooted, but that the latter assigned his advanced age as a reason for postponing the project. These rumours and conjectures derive no small countenance from the recent formation at Rome of an association under the title, "Oriental Society for the Union of all the Christians of the East." The prospectus of this Society, of which the Bishop of *Hésébon*<sup>2</sup>, *in partibus*, is the chancellor, was published at Rome on June the 17th, 1847, the first anniversary of the exaltation of Pius IX. It gives an outline of the intended operation of the Society, under the three heads, "object, government, finance." The object is stated to be the bringing back of all the Eastern Christian communions to the ancient unity of the faith, first, by prayers; secondly, by science. Under the head prayers, the prospectus contains the following regulations:

"The members of the Society engage to offer special prayers for their brethren in the East, beseeching God to bring back those that have gone astray, and to preserve the others in the unity of the one fold and one Shepherd, established by our Lord Jesus Christ. With this view the members of the Society engage,—but with this reservation, that by failing to do so, they shall not be involved in the slightest fault in the sight of God,—to observe the following practices:

"1. *Priests*. Besides the prayers which all the members offer in common, to celebrate the holy sacrifice of the mass for the promotion of this work, once at least in every year, on the anniversary of the foundation of the Society. If they cannot conveniently do so on that day, they will discharge this duty at some other time more convenient to themselves.

"2. *Lay members*. To communicate in the same manner and at the same time.

<sup>1</sup> A similar mode of dispensing the spiritual graces, of which the Pope claims to be the depositary, is announced at this moment in England by public advertisement: a rosary of agates, with an autograph letter of Pius IX., for the distressed Irish, is to be raffled for."

<sup>2</sup> Qu. Esbuntis, or *Ἐσβουσι*, in Arabia!



" 3. *All members, clerical and lay.* To recite once every day the *Ave Maria*, with a threefold repetition of the invocation: 'Admirable Mother, Queen of the Apostles, pray for us.'

" 4. The Society will have a special devotion to the Holy Virgin, to the Holy Apostles, to the Holy Doctors of the East, and to all the Holy Popes who have laboured to maintain or restore the unity of faith among Christians."

Under the head science, the prospectus contemplates the reprint of liturgical, dogmatic, historical and other writings in defence of the ancient orthodox faith of the East, in the vernacular tongues;" the publication of a periodical under the title, "Eastern Religious Review;" the establishment of elementary and higher schools for both sexes all over the East, and of ecclesiastical seminaries for the education of a native clergy, and "the preservation of those ancient national rites which the Roman Church justly considers as precious monuments of her apostolicity and catholicity."

The government of the Society is vested in a central committee, resident at Rome, and consisting of the cardinal prefect of the propaganda as president, two vice-presidents, one oriental, the other Latin, and a Latin chancellor, who must always be bishops, prelates, or secular priests resident at Rome, and from ten to twelve other members, one half oriental, the other half Latin. The Duke de Cadore, a French peer, and a member of the committee, has been appointed to the office of treasurer. There are to be branch committees in the different capitals, and local committees in towns of less importance; and where no committee can be formed, the business of the Society is to be transacted by individual commissioners.

The funds are to be raised by voluntary contributions, one Roman dollar annually being the fixed contribution of the members; instead of which, those who cannot afford it, will have "to perform some corporal or spiritual work of mercy for the benefit of their neighbour, and specially of some member of the eastern communion." The accounts of the funds collected in all parts of the world are to be sent in to the central committee at Rome, to which the administration of them belongs, and which will draw upon the local committees.

*The Jews and the Papacy.*—Among the curious circumstances and signs of the times to which the policy of Pius IX. has given rise, is the fact of an address to the pope from the Jews of Nakel, a town in Posen, thanking him for his benevolent intentions towards the Israelites of the pontifical states, and hailing the example set by him as the commencement of the general emancipation of the Jews from their present state of servility and social degradation. The language of that address is no less curious than the fact itself. "Will not Christian doctors henceforward consider it as the fairest object of their sacred functions, to break the chains which human folly has forged for the hearts of men, since *the anointed of the Lord* inculcates by very deed the principle, that 'to be free and to make free,' is the result of Christian feeling? Can Christian princes any longer find a difficulty



in throwing down the still existing barriers by which men are mercilessly separated from each other, since *the most exalted representative of Christianity* has taught them by his acts that true Christianity is love, which does not sever, but unite? And will Christian nations still persist in rising up against the idea of acknowledging their Israelitish fellow-citizens as their brethren and their equals, since *the holy father* has declared that 'we have all but one Father?' That happy news has been hailed with shouts of delight, not by us Israelites only; it has found a joyful echo in the hearts of those who devote their noblest efforts to the exaltation of the Christian religion; and, therefore, Pope Pius IX., surrounded by universal homage, will not only be dear and present to the memory of his contemporaries, but history will hand down his glorious name to posterity, and inform hereafter the most distant generations that it was he who approached nearest to Christian truth. Forgive, *holy father*, if the undersigned venture respectfully to lay at the foot of *the holy see* these thanksgivings, as a feeble expression of feelings deeply engraven in their hearts; if they venture humbly to ask the gracious acceptance of these thanksgivings at the hands of *the holy father who has now become our holy and loving father also.*"

The office of chief rabbi at Rome, which has been vacant for twelve years past, the pontifical government having refused its permission for the election of a successor after the death of the late rabbi, has recently been filled up, and the new chief rabbi solemnly installed. His name is Rabbi Israel Katzan; he was called to his new post from the borders of the lake of Genesareth, where he enjoyed a great reputation of sanctity and talmudistic learning. He was born at Jerusalem, and his pedigree is traced back for ten centuries, in an uninterrupted line of Levitical ancestors.

**RUSSIA.**—*Fierce Proselytism of the Greek Church.*—The latest accounts both from Poland and from the Baltic provinces, contain bitter complaints of the continuance of the system of violent and fraudulent proselytism among the ignorant Roman Catholic and Lutheran populations, respectively, of those two provinces, which we noticed in a former number of our Review<sup>1</sup>. In the Baltic provinces, the number of conversions amounted, according to the official report of the Minister of the Interior, in the year 1845 alone, to 16,500. The fruit has been, great excitement among the Lutheran population, followed up by energetic remonstrances on the part of the nobility and clergy; and although there appears to be little hope that the aggrieved parties will meet with due attention and impartial justice at the hands of the Russian government, yet the impulse which has been given both to the great landed proprietors and to the ministers, is likely to prove in the end useful rather than prejudicial to the interests of the Lutheran community. The profound ignorance of the most elementary points of their faith,

<sup>1</sup> See English Review, vol. vi. pp. 221, 222.

which has been brought to light among the peasantry of the Baltic provinces by the facility with which the emissaries of the Greek Church circumvented them, has led to the adoption of measures for the formation of schools, for the instruction of the children of the lower classes. Meanwhile, those portions of the population which the late and still continued efforts of proselytism have once turned away from the faith of their fathers, will not find it an easy matter to retrace their steps, though very many, it is said, bitterly repent, and have even addressed the emperor in petitions, suing for permission to return to their former communion. This permission has been decidedly refused ; and, to stem the tide of recantation, an imperial edict has recently been published, which abundantly attests the fierce spirit of persecution in which the Russian autocrat labours to establish unity of worship in his vast dominions. In order fully to appreciate its provisions, it must be borne in mind that they are applicable not only to those who were originally members of the Greek Church, but to those also who, having been persuaded, or entrapped, into making a profession of the Russo-Greek faith, might wish to return to their former communion. The following are the principal provisions of the edict in question.

“ 1. Whoever shall have abjured the Russo-Greek faith, shall be placed in the hands of the ecclesiastical authority. If he has parents belonging to the Russo-Greek religion, he is *ipso facto* disinherited. His property is to be put under trust, and he is not to be allowed to dwell in the district where his property, moveable or immoveable, was situated. These last measures will cease if the proselyte returns to the bosom of the dominant Church ; if he does not do so within the time assigned him by the ecclesiastical authority, he is to be arraigned before a criminal tribunal, which shall pass sentence on him, the least amount of punishment to be inflicted being perpetual detention in a Russo-Greek convent, in which he will have to undergo constant acts of penance and contrition. If the proselyte has children under age, the government will decide upon their destination.

“ 2. Whoever shall permit his wife or his children to embrace a strange faith, shall likewise be arraigned before a criminal tribunal, and be punished according to the full rigour of the law.

“ 3. Whoever shall be found guilty of having induced a person to abjure the Russo-Greek faith, shall lose the prerogative of his rank, and all his civil rights, and be banished for life into Western Siberia. If he belongs to the class to which corporal punishment is applicable, he shall receive a certain number of blows with the knout, and serve for the remainder of his life in one of the disciplinary companies.

“ 4. Whoever shall be found guilty of having pronounced discourses, or published writings tending to induce persons to abjure the Russo-Greek faith, shall lose the prerogative of his rank, and shall be imprisoned for a year or two in a house of correction. In case of relapse, the delinquent shall be condemned to the loss of his civil rights, and to hard labour in a fortress for the space of from four to six years. If he is found guilty a third time, he shall be banished into the provinces

of Tobolsk or Timsk, in Siberia. Independently of these punishments, he shall, if he belongs to the class to which corporal chastisement is applicable, receive the knout.

"5. Parents of the Russo-Greek communion, who cause their children to be baptized into another Christian communion, shall be punished with two years' imprisonment, and their children taken from them, to be brought up by other members of their family professing the Russo-Greek religion; if they have no relatives of that communion, the government will appoint guardians, who are to take charge of them.

"6. Whoever shall prevent any member of a strange communion from embracing the Russo-Greek faith, shall be punished with several months' imprisonment.

"7. Any minister of a strange religion who shall teach minors of the Russo-Greek communion the principles of his religion, even though he should have no intention to convert them, shall be suspended from the exercise of his functions for one or more years. In case of relapse, he shall be sentenced to one or two years' imprisonment, and shall be placed for perpetuity under the *surveillance* of the state police.

"8. The Roman Catholic clergy in the Western provinces, both regular and secular, are prohibited from having any person of the Russo-Greek communion in their service, and that under a penalty of forty silver rubles (160 francs) for each servant."

A curious grievance, connected with the religious despotism of the Czar, has arisen in the capital itself, and bears upon no less a personage than the Roman Catholic Bishop of Petersburg. An imperial ukase, issued last year, renders it compulsory upon all public servants of the first eight classes, to be present on Sundays and festivals at public worship in the imperial chapel. The Roman Catholic Bishop, ranking among "the public servants of the fourth class," was called upon, in conformity with the terms of the edict, to attend in his place, which, by way of doing him honour, is one of the most conspicuous seats in the chapel. With the fear of Siberia before his eyes, the Bishop complied; and although he has obtained licence to absent himself on the highest festivals, on the plea of his having to officiate pontifically in his own church, his presence, and, during the recital of certain state prayers, in a kneeling posture, is insisted on with all the greater strictness.

THE  
ENGLISH REVIEW.

---

DECEMBER, 1847.

---

- ART. I.—1. *Sketches of Ireland Sixty Years Ago.* Dublin: M'Glashan.
2. *Letters on the Condition of the People of Ireland.* By THOMAS CAMPBELL FOSTER, Esq. London: Chapman and Hall.
3. *The Case of the Church Education Society of Ireland, argued, in Reply to CHARLES RICHARD ELINGTON, D.D.* By GEORGE MILLER, D.D., Vicar-General of Armagh. London: Seeleys.

IRELAND—is a theme full of sad and melancholy reflections to every Christian and philanthropist. It is the more so, because the remedies for the worst evils of that unhappy country are so obvious to those who really understand the subject, and yet so probably unattainable, that the poignancy of regret is enhanced by the tantalizing prospect of a relief apparently within reach, which we feel and know can scarcely actually come. We presume that if any person who understands the state of Ireland were asked to point out the great evil and mischief which broods over that devoted land, he would reply that it is the utter powerlessness of the law. Ireland is a country in which the law is systematically set at defiance—in which almost the whole population are banded together for the purpose of bearing down by force and intimidation such legal rights as they may choose to denounce. This is not an evil of recent date: it has increased in intensity for a long series of years, and is apparently destined to continue and prevail yet more widely.

The condition of Ireland from the conquest in the reign of Henry II. till the reign of King William, was in general one of internal warfare, between feudal chieftains and Irish dynasts. The dominion of England was merely nominal in the greater part of Ireland until the reign of James I. Ireland was then conquered, or reduced to obedience; but the mild government of England soon relaxed its coercive measures, and the result was the Rebellion of 1641, which began with the massacre of 100,000 Churchmen and Protestants, under circumstances of revolting cruelty absolutely unparalleled in the history of Europe. It was the unsuccessful struggle made by James II. in Ireland that prostrated finally the power of feudalism and clanship, and laid the foundations of a more peaceable state of things. Ireland

remained from that moment in a state of comparative peace until the repeal of the penal laws against Romanism. The population had been taught the necessity of submitting to the dominion of England. But from the moment that the penal laws were removed in the reign of George III. till the present time, Ireland has been afflicted by a series of disturbances which have gradually arisen to such a pitch of atrocity, that at this moment there is not, we believe, a country in any part of the world which is so deeply stained with crime. Let us not be misunderstood in saying this. We do not attribute the disturbances of Ireland merely to the repeal of the penal laws, or suppose that their continuance on the statute-book would have maintained peace in Ireland. We allude to their abolition merely as an indication of that kind of weak, undecided, and vacillating government which has since then existed, with occasional intervals.

The national temperament in Ireland accounts, of course, for much that excites the surprise of an Englishman, in contemplating the condition of that country. Ardour even to enthusiasm; a disposition the very reverse of that cool, steady, and persevering spirit, so characteristic of an Englishman; the mixture of reckless daring and drollery, idleness and industry, crime and good-nature, superstition and religion, quite bewilders an English mind; and the traveller, who generally views the Irish character in its more agreeable aspect, returns home with a thorough conviction that a more interesting, delightful, and ill-used people does not exist. The accounts of assassinations and murders which the public prints supply, are very generally disbelieved by educated Englishmen, who cannot conceive the existence of a state of society so unlike any thing which prevails elsewhere.

The lawless state of Irish society is, as we have observed, an evil of long standing. The very curious and amusing volume entitled "*Ireland Sixty Years Ago*," exhibits a state of society widely different indeed, in many points, from that which now exists, but still manifesting, though in a different way, the same total disregard for law which has been transmitted to the present day. The author of the volume congratulates himself and his readers on the great "*improvement*" which has taken place in Ireland in the course of the last sixty years, and on "*the years of peace, which have taught us to prefer quiet and industry to violence and scheming.*" He even goes so far as to assert, that the "*peace and good order* which have long been the boast" of England, have begun to form a part of the Irish character also! We can scarcely suppose that this is written ironically, for trifling on so serious a subject as the present state of Ireland

is hardly conceivable; but most assuredly, this writer has made a very great mistake, if he imagines that because "fights in the streets, gambling upon coffins, bucks, bullies, rapparees, duelling, drunkenness, bull-baiting, idleness, abduction, clubs, &c." have disappeared, the state of Ireland has improved in a moral or social point of view. We confess that much as there is in the customs of the by-gone age in Ireland which is revolting to our feelings and principles, yet we would most gladly exchange Ireland as it is, for Ireland as it was sixty years ago. We would thankfully accept bull-fights, and faction-fights—aye, even abduction of heiresses, and duelling, instead of a system of MURDER and ASSASSINATION, carried on with the aid and connivance of the whole population. We would rather see "bucks" than "agitators," and "drunkenness" and "idleness" than energies employed in purchasing powder and fire-arms, and shooting down clergymen, landlords, and land-agents, as if they were so many snipe<sup>1</sup>. The utter recklessness to human life exhibited by the Irish peasantry has always been shocking in the extreme. We can recollect that, years ago, it was distinctly proved in a court of law that half-a-crown, or even a glass of whiskey, was enough to procure the assassination of any one. And what is the worst of all is, that murderers almost invariably escape punishment. No one will give testimony against them. No amount of reward will procure their discovery. Thousands of pounds may be subscribed to bring a murderer to justice, but he is never betrayed; he is protected, and treated with respect and sympathy by the whole population. So far from any feeling of shame existing on the perpetration of the most barbarous assassinations, the example is held out immediately by the secret leaders of the people, as a means of terrifying landlords and all other persons into obedience to their wishes. We cannot, under such circumstances, agree with the author of "*Ireland Sixty Years Ago*," in thinking that there is a change *for the better* in Ireland.

In the times of which this author speaks, there was indeed lawlessness enough in that country. Highway robberies, for instance, were frequent; and some of the deeds of the marauders of those days have been transmitted, in prose and verse, even to the present day. It is not very long, indeed, since the history of "*Irish Rogues and Rapparees*" was the ordinary Manual for reading in the schools of the peasantry. Some account of the contents of this volume is given by the author of the work before

<sup>1</sup> We need never again speak of Irish blundering, when the Government itself has committed so great a blunder, in permitting a disaffected population to possess of fire-arms and ammunition!



us ; and amongst the heroes who figure in its pages, Freney, the robber, occupies a conspicuous place.

He was the son of a servant in the house of Mr. Robbins, a gentleman in the county of Kilkenny, who appears to have employed every means in his power to correct the evil dispositions which manifested themselves in Freney at an early age. His friends were, at length, obliged to abandon him as incorrigible, and he became a highwayman.

“ He collected round him all the idle and worthless fellows of the neighbourhood, whom he formed into a gang of robbers, and over whom he exercised absolute control, an object of alarm and terror to Kilkenny, and the neighbouring counties. The manner of their proceeding was very summary. When a house was set to be robbed, he proceeded to a forge in the vicinity, and ordering one of his gang to open it, and take out a sledge, they went at once to the house, dashed in the door or windows, and rifled it of all its valuable property. Such was the terror they excited, and the system of violence they pursued, that they were rarely opposed. During the day they stopped travellers, and robbed in the highway, and even levied black-mail on carmen, openly demanding a ransom for the goods they seized . . . . On one occasion, five cars, proceeding from Waterford to Thomastown, loaded with valuable shop-goods, were thus stopped, their ransom set down at 150*l.*, and one of the drivers sent to fetch it. While Freney was, as usual, waiting for their return, in confident expectation, one of his scouts ran back with information that a body of the merchants of Waterford, accompanied by a strong force of the militia, were near at hand to take him. He looked out, and saw the road beset on all sides. He ran, and after some pursuit, concealed himself in a cleft of a rock, covered by furze and brambles. Here he laid his loaded musket across his body, and a case of cocked pistols at each side of him, and, after waiting for some time, expecting his pursuers, *he fell fast asleep*. One of the party in search of him heard him snoring, looked in, and having ascertained who it was, immediately ran to announce to the pursuers his discovery. Freney was immediately surrounded by the *posse*, who began firing into the spot where he lay. The sound awakened him, and he saw the ground about him riddled and torn by the balls which passed over his body. He lay still until some of the party, supposing he must be dead, were about to pull him out by the legs, when he suddenly started up, and rushed out with his musket cocked. The terror of his name, and the suddenness of his appearance, frightened the party. They all, military and mercantile, ran off in different directions, each man alarmed for his own safety ; while Freney, availing himself of the momentary panic, escaped under cover of a neighbouring hedge.”—pp. 103—105.

Amidst the atrocities of these brigands, there were occasional glimmers of more human feelings than they could have been supposed to possess. There is something almost affecting in the



death of the old freebooter, "Shawn Crossach," who educated his two sons in acts of robbery from their childhood, and who, at length, was taken up, with them, for a robbery committed on an officer of rank.

"For this daring deed on a high functionary, they were all apprehended, tried, and convicted. After sentence was passed, it was represented that two victims would be a sufficient example to satisfy justice, and mercy might be shown to the old man. They were all, however, led out to execution, but at the gallows, the father was told that he was pardoned by the mercy of Government. He looked no way glad, but the contrary, and, at first, offered to exchange the pardon with "Paurya Fhad," his youngest son. When he was informed that this could not be allowed, he said, after a short deliberation, 'Well, I'm an old man, any how, and can't live long, and what use will pardon be to me? so, wi' the blessing of God, I'll shake a foot wi' the boys.' He persisted in his determination, and would listen to no persuasion against his right to be hanged, and have his sentence executed; so he suffered between his two sons, holding affectionately one of their hands at each side."—p. 107.

We have no reason to believe that freebooting was carried to a greater extent in Ireland than in Scotland, or even England, at the same period. It is not so long since highway robberies were frequent in the neighbourhood of London itself. But in the practice of duelling, we believe, Ireland was far a-head of either country. Duels in Ireland, within the last fifty years, were conducted with a "pomp and circumstance" which they certainly never attained in England. We have never heard of duels in this country, in which the combatants on each side were attended to the field by a long array of lords and gentlemen, magistrates, and county authorities, and by thousands of the lower orders, as eager and anxious witnesses of the fray. Such things have been in Ireland in the nineteenth century. And so far did this system of duelling extend, that a plain man, bent on his business, could hardly help giving offence to some of the bullies, who were to be found in every place of public resort. We have several anecdotes, in the volume before us, illustrative of this state of things. At a coffee-house in Dublin, on one occasion, a plain man of genteel appearance was crossing the room for a newspaper, as one of the "bucks" of the day was passing, and touched by accident the train of his morning gown; the owner instantly drew his sword; and the poor man was obliged to draw his, without either intending or knowing how to use it. The "buck" drove him to the wall, and was just about to pin him to it with his sword, when he rushed at him, in an impulse of self-preservation, and without aim or design pierced him through the body.

Amongst the noted duellists of those days was Pat Power of Daragle—a fat robust man, distinguished for intemperance, with a glowing red face. Power's pistol was always at the service of any one who did not wish to fight. In England he had various rencontres with persons who were struck by his appearance and his brogue.

“On one occasion a group of gentlemen were sitting in a box at one end of the room when Power entered at the other. When Power took his seat in the box, the waiter came to him with a gold watch, with a gentleman's compliments, and a request to know what o'clock it was by it. Power took the watch, and then directed the waiter to let him know the person that sent it; he pointed out one of the group. Power rang the bell for his servant, and directed him to bring his pistols and follow him. He put them under his arm, and with the watch in his hand, walked up to the box, and presenting the watch, begged to know to whom it belonged. When no one was willing to own it, he drew his own old silver one from his fob, and presented it to his servant, desiring him to keep it; and putting up the gold one, he gave his name and address, and assured the company he would keep it safe till called for. It never was claimed. On another occasion he ordered supper, and while waiting for it, read the newspaper. After some time the waiter laid two covered dishes on the table, and when Power examined their contents he found they were two dishes of smoking potatoes. He asked the waiter to whom he was indebted for such good fare, and he pointed to two gentlemen in the opposite box. Power desired his servant to attend him, and directing him in Irish what to do, quietly made his supper off the potatoes, to the great amusement of the Englishmen. Presently his servant appeared with two more covered dishes, one of which he laid down before his master, and the other before the persons in the opposite box. When the covers were removed there was found in each a loaded pistol. Power took up his, and cocked it, telling one of the others to take up the second, assuring him that they were at a very proper distance for a close shot, and if one fell he was ready to give satisfaction to the other. The parties immediately rushed out without waiting for a second invitation, and with them several persons in the adjoining box.”—pp. 27, 28.

Such fire-eaters were by no means uncommon in Ireland. Bryan Maguire, one of the last of the race, was seen for whole days leaning out of his window in Dublin, for the purpose of insulting passers-by. If he deemed any one a fit subject, he threw some rubbish or dirt upon him, and when the man looked up, he spat in his face. He then crossed his arms, presented a pistol in each hand, and invited him up stairs to settle the affair.

Of course, in such a state of society, it became necessary for every gentleman to understand the use of his weapons, in order to protect his life. But still, there was nothing of combination in

: it was merely the ferocity of individuals which disturbed the public peace. Life was taken away in obedience to a false code of honour; and openly, in the field, not by systematic assassination.

The drunkenness, the faction fights, which our author describes, which used to be, until recently, so characteristic of the lower orders in Ireland, have disappeared under the influence of Father Mathew and Daniel O'Connell. But they have been replaced by kite outrages, which the Government have vainly endeavoured to check by appointing additional police, increasing the number of the military, and by the offer of rewards for the discovery of the offenders. It would be superfluous for us, after the announcements in the newspapers for the last few months, to attempt to describe the state of Ireland at present. An organized conspiracy has long pervaded all parts of the land, in which the whole of the Romish population is engaged. This combination is for the purpose of giving to the tenantry the permanent possession of the land they occupy, at such rents as they may please to pay. If any tenant is refused for non-payment of the rent he has engaged to pay, the order either of the person who succeeds to his holding, or of the landlord-agent, or of the landlord, is the almost invariable result. These orders are performed by persons who are summoned by a secret committee from some distant part of the country; their mission is generally well known to the surrounding population; and they are in all cases sheltered by the people from pursuit and detection. This frightful system extends to all cases in which the lower orders imagine their rights to be infringed on. The manager of mines, of manufactories, or of railroads, is liable, on any difference with his workmen, to assassination.

There cannot be any doubt that Ireland is more deeply stained by this crime than any other country in Europe. It is true that terrible crimes are perpetrated in other countries—in some cases as barbarous as any which are committed in Ireland. England itself is occasionally the scene of detestable murders;

Spain, Greece, and other countries, are extremely disorganized in some respects. But there is no nation in the world which is so much devoted to the Romish population of Ireland, banded together for the perpetration of murder and the protection of murderers. We shall not be deemed unjust or uncharitable by our readers, if we express an opinion which is deeply rooted in our mind, that the curse of blood which seems to hang over Ireland, is the penalty of the blood which has been shed by her population, and which has never been avenged. A country, steeped in the guilt of cold-blooded systematic murder, cannot, we think, ever be blessed. If crime, in so frightful a form as history scarcely records, has

fallen upon that wretched land, can it be said that the punishment in any degree exceeds the crimes which still remain unavenged? What proportion of the murderers of the last twenty years have been punished? The conviction of a murderer in Ireland never takes place. And why? Because murders are the acts of the people at large.

In our view there is no prospect for Ireland but that of increasing misery and suffering, while the curse of Heaven is upon its deeds of blood. "Repeal" would, indeed, lead to massacre; but the continuance of English rule is only an *inferior* evil. As long as Ireland is made the stalking-horse of party—as long as parties and politicians in England are found to endeavour to win their way to power by encouraging discontent and crime in Ireland; so long will Ireland continue to be what she has been. As long as England is too jealous of the *name* of liberty to permit the establishment of the only kind of government which can preserve peace in Ireland—a government of a *permanently* coercive character—so long will the Government of England permit all law and justice to be set at nought, and murder to stalk with impunity through the land. We feel and know, that England is so divided, that it is *impossible* to establish a government suited to Ireland. The same kind of disposition which prompts our legislature to withdraw all protection from native produce and manufacture, will always induce them to shrink from the use of *permanent* coercion, however requisite. In the most extreme cases coercion is never applied, even nominally, for more than a year or two, to Ireland. The Parliament appears always to be under the impression, that in legislating for Ireland, it is legislating for England.

The result of recent legislation on the poor-laws is rapidly reducing the landlords of Ireland to beggary. With them will fall one of the last ties and connexions which bind Ireland to England. Discouraged as they had been for a long series of years by government, and almost discountenanced, they still constituted an obstacle to the triumph of that deep animosity to England which will not be rooted out of the Irish mind, and which no favours can in any degree appease. That obstacle is now breaking down. The landlords of Ireland are being reduced to poverty; and one remedy now proposed for the ills of Ireland is to facilitate the sale of incumbered property—i. e. to enable the ruined gentry of Ireland to relinquish their lands. England is sacrificing her friends in Ireland, because she has not firmness to hold Ireland in subjection. To suggest measures for the pacification of Ireland is a mere mockery, when it is evident that England is *incapable* of adopting such a firm and consistent course in regard to Ireland.

as would humble and subdue that country. There are too many politicians who dream that Ireland can only be pacified by concession,—on the principle, we presume, which would dictate the immediate surrender of property to a highwayman, as the only means of pacification. Do these wise men imagine that Napoleon Buonaparte would not have found means to reduce Ireland to the most abject submission in the course of a single month, without making the slightest concession to a disaffected peasantry? Ireland is to be ruled only by making the laws respected; by striking terror into the evil-disposed; by humbling the entire population in the first instance. After this had been accomplished, a government armed with sufficient powers, if continued for fifty years in Ireland, would trample out the seeds of evil in the national character. This is, we fear, impossible, while Ireland is subject to England; and therefore we do not see any remedy for the ills of that unhappy country. England has not the firmness, and consistency of rule, which could alone make Ireland peaceful and prosperous. Ireland is a country which is geographically separated from England—which is inhabited by a different race of people—and which has a strong sense of nationality in spite of the legislative union. Ireland dislikes England, and her laws, and institutions; and seeks her own independence by playing on the generosity, the fears, and the prejudices of England. England gets weary of the game, and, in her impatience, is ready to bribe Ireland to quiet by the sacrifice of whatever she may demand. But every concession is a gain to the cause of Irish independence—an encouragement to further demands—a step to the prostration of English power. Ireland is too weak to cope with England in the field: she has often tried that experiment, and always failed. But she is steadily making aggressions on England; and some day or other, we fear, it will be found, that Ireland has united her whole population in the cause of national independence, and that she has confederates in England itself, as well as in foreign countries, who will aid to place her in the position which she covets.

The grand mistake in the English system of governing Ireland is, its desultory character. There is no system which is invested with powers adequate to grapple with the difficulties of Ireland: whenever those powers are given, they are merely granted for a limited time, and as soon as they expire, the country again becomes the scene of crime. Until the English mind can be convinced that a *strong* government ought to exist in Ireland—a government armed with *full* powers to preserve the peace—powers of a different character from those exercised by the Government in England—there will be no material alteration in the state of

Ireland. We are not advocates for any attempt to govern Ireland by placing government in the hands of either party in that country: this would only add to the evils of that unhappy land. What we do wish to see, is a government, which, however it may be disposed to conciliate one or both religious parties, shall be armed with *permanent* powers adequate to the repression of crime and lawlessness in Ireland. Nothing can be worse than the system which allows lawlessness to be the chronic disease of the social system, and which only rarely in extreme cases resorts to repression. It is exactly the conduct of a parent, who is either too weak or too indolent to correct the vices of his child, except in cases where they become intolerable to himself. The local government of Ireland ought not to be obliged to come to parliament every three or four years, and ask for legal powers to keep the peace, and protect people from being murdered. We would remind our readers that experience has shown, that the Irish people require a stronger executive than is necessary in England. When disturbances such as we are familiar with, have been going on for twenty or thirty years, and with the full concurrence of the whole of the Romish population—that is, the great majority of the Irish people—it is evident to common sense, that the same kind of government which is suited to England is not suited to Ireland. An entire generation has been allowed to grow up in habitual connexion with crimes against the public peace. The whole population has been permitted to increase in habits of utter recklessness and disregard to the laws. Can it be reasonably expected, that a population like this will be reduced to peace and order, either by mere measures of conciliation, which it mistakes for weakness and fear; or by Coercion Acts which last for a year or two? What is the consequence when such Coercion Acts are passed? Crime and outrage cease, to a great degree, during the time of the operation of such Acts—but they *revive* as soon as the Acts expire. This is just what might have been expected. The evil-doers in Ireland are always intimidated at any display of firmness on the part of Government—they have felt its powers before now. They can very well afford to pause in their career of aggression for a year. They know that at the end of that time they will be at liberty to begin it again; and they know by experience, that many years will elapse before the English Parliament will consent to pass another Coercion Bill. Therefore, on this system, no impression whatever is made on the lawless *habits* of the people: they still remain in all their force, and even continually increase. On the whole, we greatly doubt the expediency of enacting Coercion Bills like that which has just passed the Legislature. Measures of this kind are mere



temporary palliatives: they are not calculated to work a cure. They are almost as disagreeable to the self-willed patient, as really efficient remedies would be; and they do not touch the root of the disease—the *habit* of lawlessness.

We believe that several measures have been passed within the last twenty or thirty years, which, if they had been permanent, instead of temporary, would have made Ireland a peaceful, and a prosperous country. To expect gentry to reside, or capitalists to invest their means in lands, or manufactures, in the midst of a lawless population, is simply unreasonable.

We are not amongst those who lay to the charge of the Romish priesthood of Ireland, the whole of the disturbances in that country. We ascribe them chiefly to the lawless disposition of the people, unchecked by any sufficient control on the part of Government. The Romish priesthood are themselves taken from the lowest orders, and sympathize with them generally: but, we believe, that they rather *connive* at the system of outrage so generally prevalent, than openly encourage it. They are seldom found to afford any direct encouragement: but they are, for many reasons, unwilling to attempt to check it, and they never do so. They are, in fact, themselves aware, that such is the lawlessness of their flocks, that their own power and emoluments would be endangered, if they attempted to oppose the popular will. Whenever a Romish priest does so, his congregation refuse to pay their dues.

The permanent weakness of the Irish government thus, in fact, coerces the Romish priesthood into connivance at the system of crime which is so fearfully prevalent: at least, it affords no sort of protection or encouragement to those amongst the Romish priesthood who might be disposed to promote obedience to the law. And from this insufficiency of the powers of the executive in Ireland, result the continual disturbances of that country, the necessity for repeated applications to Parliament for legislative powers, and, we believe, much of the *distress* which is continually recurring, and which arises in some degree from habits created by lawlessness.

Were the executive in Ireland armed at all times with power to keep the peace, Ireland might be easily governed, by repressing crime with a steady hand, and affording protection to all classes of the population. This would do far more for the temporal prosperity of Ireland, than any legislation on other subjects.

We would only add, that if Government deems it expedient to conciliate the Romish party in Ireland, they ought, at least, to adopt measures for conciliating the opposite party also. We



have no hopes at present, however, of seeing such a policy realized.

In the present condition and prospects of Ireland we have, humanly speaking, only one source of hope. The neglected and injured minority of the inhabitants of Ireland, are, by their descent and their religion, connected with Great Britain. The loyal and high-spirited gentry and aristocracy of Ireland—a body imbued it may be, with its peculiar prejudices—a body not without its peculiar faults—but yet a body firmly and faithfully attached to the land from whence their forefathers came, may fail: but still it will not be easy to exterminate the million or two of Churchmen and Presbyterians who inhabit Ulster; and while this population remains, there will be *one* province of Ireland in which respect will be paid to the laws, and in which the system of assassination will not be permitted to continue. For the remainder of Ireland we can, at present, only apprehend a perpetuation of the system of murders, with occasional intervals of a year or two, during the continuation of Coercion Acts.

But we confess that, in looking upon the fact of the existence of the Church in Ireland, we derive a comfort which no merely human considerations could supply. It may be, that there are defects in the Irish Church which we should be glad to see corrected. (and who will say that the English Church herself is altogether free from similar defects?) but this we do say, that no one who really knows the character of the Irish clergy, whatever may be his opinions, can fail to respect and to admire them. Their position is, in the majority of cases, most trying and even painful. Surrounded by large masses of population banded in confederacy against the English laws and religion, and under the absolute control of a priesthood more numerous and immeasurably more powerful than that of the Church; the clergy have to retain their scattered and intimidated flocks from an apostacy which holds out many temptations, and to endeavour to promote the spiritual welfare of Romanists, under the moral certainty that persecution of the most frightful character will overtake those who listen to their instructions. In the midst of perils and of discouragements, these admirable clergy have continued patiently and stedfastly to labour in their high and holy vocation. In the time of famine and of sickness they were felt to be the most faithful friends of the people, without discrimination of creed. Amidst their poverty they have preferred to remain without the aid of government funds for the support of their schools, rather than give place to any principle which should exclude from the education of the young the blessings of Christian knowledge.

They have mildly, and gently, but firmly, put from them the proffered gift of an education without any distinctive religious principles. And for this they have incurred the displeasure of the powers that be." Yet, they have adopted the very same course which Romanism in Ireland is now taking under the direction of the Papal see. The "Godless Colleges" are merely a development of the same latitudinarian spirit which presided in the formation of the Irish Education Board. But we conclude that *Romanism* may with security adopt a course of resistance to any government system of mixed education, while the Church is expected to offer implicit obedience. It may indeed become a subject of inquiry how far the Government Education Board can continue to give satisfaction to Romanism, when the "Godless Colleges" have been condemned at Rome. The one seems quite as objectionable as the other on the principles of Romanism.

Be this as it may, however, we are of opinion, that the conduct of the Bishops and Clergy of Ireland has been deserving of the highest admiration, in the firm stand which they have made against the Government education measures. Whether they have in every minute detail taken their ground on the distinctive principles of the Church, may perhaps admit of doubt; but of their integrity, their firmness, and their practical faithfulness to the high trust reposed in them, there can be no question.

It is with no ordinary satisfaction that we here refer the reader to the publication of the Rev. Dr. Miller, Vicar-General of Armagh, the title of which will be found at the beginning of this Article. We have not perused any publication of this distinguished writer, which impresses us with more respect than that which is now before us. Its calmness of tone, under, certainly, very painful circumstances, is most gratifying; and the view which it takes of the duties of the Church of Ireland is of that clear and solemn character which befits an aged minister of religion, for whom the concerns of this life are well-nigh done. It must be a gratification to the friends of this eminent man to observe his energies even to the end of life, consecrated to the firm and unwavering support of the great principles on which the Church of Ireland has taken her stand. We can imagine many apparently good reasons, which may have influenced such men as Dr. Elrington and Mr. Woodward in relinquishing the cause which the great majority of the Irish prelates and clergy have so steadfastly maintained. Far be it from us to impugn in any degree the motives of such men: we feel assured that they have acted from a desire to promote the welfare of religion. But, while we do not presume to pass any censure on individuals who have faithfully laboured in the cause of the Church, and whose charac-

ter is beyond our praise ; we must still be permitted to say, that the line of conduct which the Church in general has adopted, and which Dr. Miller here justifies, is, to our mind, immeasurably more honourable to the Irish Church, and, we believe, more likely to conduce to her welfare, than any compromise or concession.

The Church of Ireland has taken its ground deliberately on the highest ground of principle, in refusing to concur in the Government plan of education ; and from that ground it cannot recede with safety. It has contended for the perusal of the Scriptures in schools, in opposition to a system which excluded them from instruction, in obedience to the will of a religion which denied their sufficiency as a rule of faith. The position of the Church of Ireland was ultimately based on the principle of the Sixth Article of the Church of England. The real question involved was the supremacy of Scripture ; and because the Irish Church would not compromise this, she refused to concur in a system of education which excluded the Scriptures from the schools. And who shall venture to blame her for this ? Who shall refuse the meed of admiration due to fidelity so steadfast ! Supposing even, that her temporal interests might have been in some way benefited by a course of concession to measures conceived in a spirit hostile to her, and intended for the aggrandizement of Romanism, could it have been wished that she had given way ? No—we would rather see the Church of Ireland throwing herself in the hour of her distress upon the protection of Providence, and adhering simply and steadfastly to the course which she has taken. She can have no hope of propitiating human governments : she cannot place reliance on any statesmen or any party. Her sole protection is the will of God : and, therefore, her policy ought to be undisturbed by hopes founded on any powers of this world. Her existence is, as it were, from day to day. If she is to fall, let it be in the attitude of steadfast faith and charity. Such, we believe, to be the sentiments of the Church of Ireland. The dangers encompassing her are known to all. It is in the full and calm view of those dangers that her course has been taken. We believe that the sentiments of the venerable author of the pamphlet before us are those of his clerical brethren in Ireland. In reply to the argument of a writer who urges that the National Board of Education is now independent of the aid of the clergy, and that they would not add to its strength in giving it, he says :—

“ My sincere belief is, that God is now trying this his Church for his own wise purposes ; and that, when He shall deem it sufficiently dis-

ed in preparation for a coming struggle, He will find his own  
ed of terminating the trial. The hearts of all men, we agree in  
nowledging, are at his disposal. Our care should, in this case, be,  
every other of difficulty, to do our duty, and to think of con-  
nces only when the claim of duty has been satisfied.

I do believe that a religious spirit is at this crisis beginning to be  
generally awakened among ourselves, and much more in England,  
promises better things. Zeal in religion is the fruit of persecu-

The churchman, who in the day of worldly prosperity regarded  
religious profession with the indifference of an ancient habit, learns  
her times to value it as a sacred profession, for no earthly consider-  
to be surrendered. The general distress of the present unhappy  
will, no doubt, as Dr. Elrington has suggested, give an excuse for  
contributing, to those who seek one, and incapacitate some of the  
zealous friends of the Church Education Society, for supporting  
schools; but I have shown that it has not yet produced these  
s, and even if it had produced them, a temporary embarrassment is  
sufficient reason for a permanent abandonment of principle. I  
moreover, that there are many minds, which the chastisement of  
en will draw away from present and worldly interests to objects of  
tual and everlasting importance. In a crisis which baffles the  
y of human speculation, the heart, which retains amidst its world-  
s any sense of religion, will draw near to God, and be disposed to  
with the Psalmist, *Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is  
upon earth that I desire beside thee.*

In their efforts to degrade the Protestant Church of Ireland, the  
ernment has of necessity pursued a course different from that, by  
h a popish king (James II.) proposed to degrade and destroy the  
estant Church of England. The immediate object, however, is  
same, for it is in this case also to render the ministers of our  
rch the agents of its degradation; but they endeavour to accom-  
this by the allurements of seduction, not by the terrors of a legal  
ecution. In the prosecution of this plan, a profuse grant of a  
lred thousand pounds, to be aided, if necessary, by a larger ex-  
liture of the public money, is offered to tempt the cupidity of those  
are impatient to be freed from the burden of their contributions  
e Church Education Society, or unwilling to submit themselves to

To the cupidity of the clergy in particular is offered the exclu-  
assurance of the ecclesiastical patronage of the Government, in the  
osal especially of the higher dignities of the establishment. In  
manner has been raised among us a golden image, to which our  
y are required to bow down, in utter abandonment of the proper  
acter of their Church.

Wonderful it is, that so few of the clergy have been hitherto found  
ield to the two-fold temptation; the great body of the parochial  
y still remains uncorrupted. These pious and conscientious men  
in effect to the minister, almost as the three faithful Jews replied  
e king of Babylon, *'If it be so, our God whom we serve, is able to*

*deliver us* from the burdens which you impose upon us, and from the discountenance with which you menace us, '*and He will deliver us out of thine hand. But if not,*' if He should have determined to try and purify us by a still continued chastening, '*be it known unto thee,*' that we will not be subservient to the plan of a vicious policy, nor will we yield to the temptations of self-interest, by which you have sought to delude us into an abject and fatal submission. This they in effect say, and I trust that the Son of God Himself will cheer them in the furnace of their affliction, and send them forth unharmed, to rejoice in the secured stability of that Church, of which they had thus approved themselves the faithful ministers."

Such sentiments as these are well fitted to sustain our clergy and laity in Ireland, amidst the trials of their position. They will, we feel assured, elicit the sympathies of all true members of the Church. They will show to the English Church the spirit in which our brethren are preparing to face the hostility of the rulers of this world. Let us not desert them in this extremity, but evince our sympathy whenever the opportunity presents itself. Doubts and unfavourable reports have been in circulation in reference to the principles of the Irish clergy. If those doubts refer to questions affecting the Church, we appeal to facts as clearing the character of these excellent men.

The actual position of the Church of Ireland in reference to the Education question, ought to be a sufficient reply to any imputation of Erastianism. Be it remembered, also, that the suppression of bishoprics in Ireland, was the act of the Government solely: the Church had no part in it. Seventeen out of the twenty-two prelates, of whom the Irish hierarchy rightfully consists, protested solemnly against this most unrighteous act. The clergy were with difficulty restrained from proceeding to elect a bishop for the first see which fell vacant after the passing of the Act, which annexed it to an adjoining diocese. Dissuaded from this attempt by the recommendations of a justly-respected prelate, which, however, referred rather to the expediency of the moment than to those higher principles of faith, which would, we feel assured, have been the true wisdom of the Church of Ireland; the clergy, and an influential body of laity in Ireland, combined to seek the restoration of their suppressed sees, but in vain. The question slept for years; when the Archbishop of Dublin—a prelate, to whom, whatever opinions may be formed on some of his views, it is impossible to refuse the respect due to sincerity, high ability, and Christian benevolence—took it up on his single responsibility, and introduced in the last session of Parliament a bill empowering the crown to restore the suspended sees. On that proposal we have already given our opinion; and we trust

that opportunities will be afforded us hereafter for lending such aid as lies in our power to that most excellent cause.

In the mean time we invite the especial attention of the reader to the following extracts from a charge recently delivered by the Archbishop of Dublin to the clergy of his diocese, which refers to the bill introduced by his grace last session, and also to the question of the episcopate generally :—

“ The bill which I brought in to remove the restriction on the royal prerogative, generally, in respect to the suppressed bishoprics, might, if passed into a law, have been brought into operation (if at all, for even that was left optional with the ministry for the time being), either on the one bishopric of Kildare, or on two, or more, if such a course should be judged advisable and unobjectionable, to those in power. I do not myself think it probable, that many bishoprics will be found of which the re-establishment would be as important, and as easily effected, as that of Kildare. And if application were made for any restoration that should appear objectionable, it would, of course, be met by a refusal. If we were to abstain from doing any thing that is wise and proper, lest we should be afterwards urged, in some different case, to do what is unwise and improper, there would be an end of all legislation.

“ It would be superfluous for me to enter at large on the reasons I assigned, as they are, in great measure, equally yours also, as expressed in the petitions in favour of the measure. The advantage is so obvious, of having a separate bishop for the diocese of Kildare, instead of adding the charge of it to one already so much overburdened, that the whole task of proof to the contrary lies on the side of those who object to the proposed measure. And again, the removal of *any* restrictions on the royal prerogative, in a case where there is no danger whatever of that prerogative being abused, is clearly in itself a good. There may, conceivably, be advantages in maintaining the restriction, and continuing the union of these sees ; but they ought to be clearly pointed out : there may be apprehended inconveniences greater than those complained of ; but it is incumbent on the opponents of the measure to give reasons for their apprehensions. And, of all the objections that I heard urged, there was none which I think likely to have weight with an intelligent legislator when bringing his mind to bear fully on the subject, and bestowing on it calm and deliberate attention :—I mean a more calm and deliberate attention than was, perhaps, to be expected in a time of so great and varied agitation, and of such overwhelming pressure of important business.

“ It seems to have been not clearly understood, or, at least, not duly considered, that there was no design of *abstracting any revenue*, either from the ecclesiastical board, or from the funds of the empire. The bill did not authorize or contemplate any outlay whatever of public money. And this circumstance must have been overlooked by those, whether opponents of the bill or professed advocates, who represented it as altogether subversive of the Church Temporalities' Act, and as



implying a complete abandonment of the grounds on which that Act was passed. For it is notorious that that Act was (professedly at least) designed for the purpose of providing a revenue to supply the want of church cess. Its proposed object was that of keeping the churches in repair, and furnishing the other needful expenses for divine service, through the ecclesiastical board, supplied with funds (which could not be obtained otherwise from the suppressed bishoprics. This was the professed object of those who introduced and who supported that Act. None of them, as far as I know, ever represented the bishoprics as a *positive evil*, and their suppression as a good in itself. But they set forth the necessity of providing a revenue for the above purposes, and the impossibility which no one even attempted to disprove, of providing it any other way."

If our memory does not fail us, a suggestion was made at the time, that the sum required for the purpose of providing for the above objects, might be provided by reducing the *incomes* instead of the *numbers* of the hierarchy of Ireland; but to that suggestion no sufficient attention was paid. We are willing to do full justice to the motives which induced such persons as the Archbishop of Dublin to support the bill; and we deem the following explanations quite satisfactory on *this* point, even while we do not concur in approving the course which was actually adopted:—

"There may indeed, perhaps, have been some among the advocates of that measure who were actuated by a feeling of hostility against the Church; either against an endowed church generally, or against our own in particular, or against the portion of it existing in this island. And it is also possible that the desire of conciliating for the present, or the hope of satisfying finally, those who were thus hostile, may have operated on the minds of others. But no such motives were avowed by the authors of the measure. And certainly none such existed in the mind of myself, who voted for it, nor, I am confident, in that of the Lord Primate, who was consulted upon it in the first instance by the then ministry.

"What we looked to was, the necessity of providing funds for the ecclesiastical board. And there cannot, therefore, be a more complete misapprehension than to view the bill I brought in,—which does not contemplate any diminution of those funds,—as at variance with the principle of the Act which established that board.

"But it was urged, that, after all, there are *English* bishoprics, which, not only in population, but even in extent, exceed any in Ireland. It probably did not occur to most of those who used, and who heard this argument, that each diocese in Ireland is visited *annually*, and in England only triennially; and moreover that an Irish archbishop has, besides, a triennial visitation of his *province*, which is a thing unknown in England. An English *diocese*, therefore, ought to be compared not so much with the *diocese* of Dublin, as with



the *province* of Dublin. But certainly there are English dioceses more extensive than any one *diocese* in Ireland; and there would be much force in this argument, if it were admitted that in England the number of bishops is *sufficient*, and the dioceses not *too large* to be satisfactorily attended to. But unhappily the reverse is notoriously the fact; as every friend to the Church in England, who is well acquainted with its circumstances, will at once admit. There are indeed persons who, estimating each man's duties by his *legal obligations*, naturally regard those of a bishop as so little onerous, that, on their computation, half the present number might suffice for the whole of the British islands. And some again talk of diligent and careful activity in the discharge of episcopal duties, as if a bishop thus qualified might be very well equal to the charge of a larger diocese than any that exists. But the reverse is the truth. It is the most supine and *negligent* bishop that would the least feel the difference between a small and a large diocese. An industrious and skilful husbandman, who keeps his land in the best state of culture, finds his labour and care increase with the extent of his farm; but one who lets his land lie untilled and overrun with weeds, may do this with equal ease over an extensive district.

“But it is not thus, I am sure, that you will form your estimate. Looking to the duties which a conscientious bishop would wish to perform, you cannot doubt that most, at least, of the English dioceses are far too large for the proper superintendence of a single bishop, and that the archbishopric of Dublin is alone no light burden.

“It may be worth while to add, in conclusion, that I found some persons objecting, not to the principle of the bill, but only to the *time* of bringing it forward. The present, it was alleged, was not a favourable occasion for making the attempt; and in this opinion I concur. There were several circumstances, which I have already adverted to, that made this session peculiarly unfavourable; but if on that ground I had indefinitely postponed the attempt (especially considering that in the next ensuing session I shall have no seat in Parliament), I have very little doubt that that very circumstance would have been urged, on any future occasion, against the measure, at least if advocated by *me*. ‘You have practically acquiesced,’ it would have been said, ‘in the existing state of the law, as far as regards the diocese of Kildare, the one in which you are more immediately concerned; and why should you *now* seek to alter it? You ought to have urged the complaint as soon as ever you had experienced the effect of the law's coming into operation as to that diocese. It is *too late* now to make the complaint *for the first time*, after having acquiesced in the arrangement, in silence, for two or three years.’ Such, I cannot doubt, is the argument I should have heard, if I had delayed bringing forward the measure till a more convenient season; but, besides this, I am also convinced, that the *first time* of proposing such a measure will always be found an unfavourable time. Experience proves the great difficulty—the all but impossibility—of carrying through any important measure in a single session; a circumstance which, as I have said, goes far to

exercising the power of a member of the Irish Synod in Parliament. In some respects, and in some of the most important, and by comparison to what is done in the case of those relating to Ireland, in a way by comparison and contrast with the session, and the arrangements will be made in the future: according to the question which arises, and in the future in such cases as afford a fair prospect of a settlement shall be made between the two.

As for the possibility of the proposed measure being ultimately carried, and I believe doing well beyond the degree of desire for it expressed by the members of the Church both in Ireland and in England, and in the degree of anxiety and of perseverance with which they may have the instrument of such change. The feeling of the legislature as a whole is against it, and it is the Church, nor yet so completely favourable as in the case of the other side of the question. The expression of the strong and deep-felt wish of a large portion of the members of the Church, lay and clerical, where it has its effect in any one time can result.

"If petitions, such as have been lately presented from England as well as Ireland, are repeated, with an increase in the numbers, both of the petitioners and of the signatures, and if corresponding energy be manifested by those in whom such petitions are introduced in Parliament, I cannot doubt that they will be ultimately successful: if, on the contrary, the greater part of the members of the United Church are contented to have done nothing, or think that they have already done enough, we cannot but expect that the matter will be suffered to drop. The non-interference of the legislature would, in that case, be not only probable, but even perhaps justifiable."

We support the claims of the Irish Church to the restoration of her legitimate number of bishops, because we feel that the expression of such a desire is in itself a claim on sympathy which cannot be resisted by any churchman. We regard it, too, as a convincing proof of the injustice of imputations which have been sometimes cast upon the Irish clergy—as holding out a pledge of their attachment to the apostolical polity of the Church. And we look to it, also, as a measure fraught with good to Ireland at large. The Church of Ireland may be compared to the "ten righteous" who would have been the means of saving the cities of the plain. She is "the salt of the earth" amidst a population more deeply immersed in crime than the heathen themselves. To her alone, her piety, her faith, her steadfastness under persecution, we look, as affording the only hope now remaining that the judgments of God will not visit that blood stained people, and render them a monument of Divine vengeance, which Babylon, or Jerusalem itself, shall not have exceeded in its awfulness.

ART. II.—*Annotations on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, designed chiefly for the use of Students of the Greek Text. By THOMAS WILLIAMSON PEILE, D.D., &c. &c. London: Rivingtons.*

ON a general survey of the subject of scriptural comments, more especially as respects the New Testament, certain simple but characteristic circumstances at once rise into view; namely, that its subject-matter is of limited extent, and does not admit of enlargement; that it has itself been prosecuted almost without intermission, though with different degrees of activity, from early times; with effort too as earnest and toilsome as any other intellectual pursuit, and, it may be presumed, in a spirit more lofty and solemn;—circumstances which might seem to justify a conclusion, that nothing now remained to be achieved, that the store was at length complete, and that a plea for an attentive reception could therefore scarcely be found on behalf of fresh contributions. As, however, the grounds on which it would be made to rest are partial, so would the conclusion itself be erroneous; but more of this hereafter. Our attention has been called to the subject by the appearance of a new labourer in the field, who presents us with a body of annotations on a difficult and important portion of the New Testament; as an earnest, too, of an extension to the entire volume. The main purpose of the author will be best described in his own words:

“Far be it from the writer of the following pages to decry the zealous observance of that Catholic maxim, QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB OMNIBUS. But in these days of hostile aggression from without, and of artfully disguised hostility and apostasy within, it is of the utmost importance that every English THEOPHILUS should perceive and know the very truth of those things which from a child he has had sounded in his ears; and this, not in simple reliance on the many able and approved expositors of *the things which are most surely believed among us*, but as having himself also been at pains to trace his religious creed to the supreme authority on which it rests, παρηκολούθηκότα ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς: Luke i. 3.

“Here, then,—in these words of the Evangelist, thus slightly modified,—is the purpose which the present undertaking is designed to subserve; to fix men's attention on the original text of the Christian Scriptures; to induce the classical scholar not to throw away the obvious advan-

tages, which early familiarity with the Greek tongue must have given him, for arriving at *the mind of Christ*, as made known in the writings of his inspired Apostles; nor to imagine that the same appliances and means by which, one after another, he has unlocked the treasures of heathen literature, can ever be out of place when applied to the 'thoughts that breathe, and words that burn' in the unchecked, unpremeditated eloquence of St. Paul."—*Preface*.

A closer view, than that which was hinted above, of the history of scriptural comment, would at once present to an unprejudiced mind a sufficiency of proof, that the task thus described and undertaken by our author is not superfluous, even in the present age. Restricting our view to the New Testament, the thoughts naturally turn in the first place to the Greek Fathers and Commentators; who, as they possessed the means of a strict analysis, and an accurate appreciation of the text of the original writings, so did not fail to employ them; thus exemplifying the use of that prime requisite, without which even the holding of sound opinions, in one who would claim to be esteemed a theologian, can be regarded but as a flimsy and insecure attainment. Indeed, a more valuable contribution towards the production of a deeper and firmer theology, than is at present prevalent among us, could scarcely be made than by the compilation, for the use of students, of an ably selected and well-digested body of Greek Scholia on the New Testament, derived from patristic sources; a well-tempered and well-knit Catena forged from ancient materials by modern hands. But in the compass of the sources from which such a store would be drawn, it must be admitted that there is no inconsiderable portion which will not commend itself to every mind, much that many would regard as fantastic in the superstructure, notwithstanding the depth and solidity of the foundation. If, for instance, time had made less havoc with his writings, should we have possessed fruit fully commensurate, in respect of solid profit, with the fine intellect, the vast learning, and marvellous industry of Origen? And herein is one ground of justification for the undertakings of fresh labourers, namely, in the fact, that a sound basis of minute attention to the letter, however necessary in itself, has not secured perfection in that which has been raised upon it;—a truth, of which, if some illustration is supplied by ancient Alexandria, there is fearful proof in the enormities of modern Germany.

The reverse of this, however, is the proper mark of the modern period; the raising of a pile without the preliminary of a foundation. The Babylonian soothsayers, with reason, exclaimed against the novel demand of their sovereign, that they should

furnish an exposition, while uninformed of the matter to be interpreted; but have we not seen something not very unlike the requirement against which they protested, to be the self-assumed task of modern commentators on Scripture—an undertaking to construct an exegetical and dogmatical fabric on a text with which they possess no real acquaintance? On looking round, indeed, on the expository productions of our own country, how rarely, in comparison with the bulk of the whole, do we meet with a performance which displays on its front the attributes of true scholarship. If this ingredient be wanting, there is further a positive bar to a sound and profitable result, even by the mere operation of chance; as will appear from the following consideration.

The case cannot be conceived of a commentator approaching his undertaking as a simple, unfurnished agent: if he brings not scholarship, analytic skill, and well-disciplined judgment, the vacancy is filled by the notions of some favourite school, or some still dearer conceptions of his own, for the maintenance of which, Scripture will supply the field, and be pressed to furnish the implements; an evil so besetting and so prevalent as to have forced upon a sagacious and experienced writer on these subjects the somewhat startling idea, that a purely infidel commentary, if it could be realized, would not be without its benefits. The evil, too, affects not only some who profess to teach, but spreads also among those who are to learn; who, instead of being about to derive, by a legitimate process, from Scripture a confirmation of previous teaching, itself drawn purely from that simple source, come to the study of that acknowledged standard, spell-bound by the technicalities of systems, and the jargon of party, and thus forfeit that delightful feeling of cheering recognition and increased clearness of perception, which would otherwise be the result of their advancing knowledge.

There is another failing—the most insidious, most prevalent, and most mischievous of all. “The greater part of mankind,” it has been observed, “quotes Scripture more by sound than sense. They take every detached sentence for a distinct assertion or apophthegm, and apply it according to its apparent meaning, after they have forcibly torn it from its context.” Here, then, where the many fall, the few are not secure; and the commentator who, free himself from this ensnaring weakness, can further be a safeguard to others, is therefore the more needed and the more to be prized. It is an expertness in this process of dissection which meets the vulgar notion of a *bonus textuarius*, assumed to be identical with the *bonus theologus*: but

it is this isolation of texts—their disruption from considerations of connexion, persons, and occasions—that has ever fostered that bane of truth and unity, the creation of systems; from which, as from some huge and complicated engine, fragments of Scripture are to be hurled against a hostile stronghold.

These shortenings, dangers, and errors of ancient and modern times have been here touched upon not as an excuse for defects nor a foil for excellences in the work before us, but simply by way of justification of the undertaking, by showing that it is not a superfluity: and, since they are the fruits not so much of moral perverseness, as of intellectual frailty, it is well that all concerned should be occasionally reminded of them.

But we must now turn to the work itself. And in the first place we may remark, that the author is not under the necessity of appealing to an examination of the book itself for proof of his fitness for the task he has undertaken, but that Dr. Peile has an immediate claim on our attention, as one furnished with clear and high credentials of scholarship. He is also, on the one hand, feelingly alive to the evil which he himself describes as “that stumbling-stone to too many interpreters of Scripture—adherence to a preconceived system of Theology;” and, on the other, has found the fruit of labour and learning in an assured recognition and a safe grasp of the teaching of the Church. This choice of the Epistle to the Romans also indicates a bold and earnest spirit, when we consider that that portion of the New Testament is by general consent regarded as one of especial difficulty; though our own opinion is, that, if the work of an interpreter is to be done thoroughly, he would find himself tasked quite as hardly in other parts.

But the bare mention of the Epistle to the Romans will call forth from all quarters the inquiry: How does the author deal with Calvinism? What are his views of Predestination? For ourselves, we would willingly reply, that if by means of a strict use of the canons of language, of sound logic, of a full and undeviating regard to all circumstances that rightfully demand consideration, and a free admission of the confluent light of Scripture; if by the employment of these means, in a spirit of simple and unfettered submission to divine teaching, there is clearly educed a conception equivalent to the scheme which is marked with the names of Augustine and Calvin,—then let the mind of the African father or the Swiss reformer, or of those who have elaborated their views, be admitted as one with the mind of the Apostle. Our author, however, has given his reply with an unshrinking negative, when, in answer to his own ques-



tion, "Where is Predestination, in the modern acceptance of the term?" he says:—

"*It is*, we reply with our Apostle—as would it had ever been—*excluded*, by more enlarged views of St. Paul's inspired teaching; suggested, in the first instance, by a closer and more critical observation of his language; sustained and strengthened by thoughtful consideration of the context, and logical connexion, of each controverted passage; and set (it is conceived) beyond all reasonable doubt or question by all that we know of the times, and of the peculiar circumstances under which he wrote."—*Preface*.

Notwithstanding this strong and satisfactory expression of the author's conviction on this point, he no where suffers the course of his annotations to be interrupted by digressions in assault of peculiar notions, thus unequivocally condemned. There is a double advantage in this. First, as regards the student: because he is not diverted from that which should be with him the primary process,—namely, an exact comprehension of the text; and, if unfortunately his mind is unduly pre-occupied, he has the advantage of a guidance under which he traverses the ground with a consciousness of a clear prospect, but without discerning those objects with which his imagination had beforehand prominently furnished it; and thus far the first step at least has been taken towards a counter-habit of mind to that which at present influences him. Secondly, as regards the great question at issue: for in favour of undiluted Calvinism—we use the term as a well understood convenience—thus much must be conceded, that its conception is bold and clear, and its frame consistent and coherent, and that it is therefore unassailable as a mere system, irrespectively of extraneous considerations: and hence it follows that, like the old philosopher with his lever, it only needs a firm standing, in possession of which it might be imposing and vigorous; and, accordingly, the proper method of dealing with it is to cut away all scriptural substratum; for which the Epistle before us has been the chosen quarry. It might be urged against the Calvinistic scheme, that it is not primitive, and that its very aspect is repulsive: but these methods are far less effective than a quiet and careful removal of the ground from under it; as is done by our author. To the former charge it might be replied, that the writings which refuse to give evidence in its favour, are but a fragmentary relic of the entire production of that age; and to the second, that mere feelings ought not to be erected into a test of speculative truth: but if Scripture be shown to deny its support, the compact fabric becomes a hopeless ruin.

It is proper, however, to remark that the course adopted in the Annotations on this particular subject is in no way attri-



butable to the want of a distinctly conceived opinion on the part of the author himself; to which he has given full expression in the Preface. In justice to him, we cite a portion of his own words, on a point where some curiosity may be felt:—

“ It (the work) would bid the reader observe how that inestimable LOVE wherewith *God so loved the world, that He gave his only-begotten Son*, and in Him *to as many as should receive Him, and believe on his name, gave power to become the sons of God*—how this grace of God, and the gift thus obtained through the grace of the One Mediator between God and Men, dates not from the birth of *the Man Christ Jesus*, but from the beginning of all things, even *before the foundation of the world*; and so *the election of grace* is, on the part of God, the one *eternal purpose*, predestination, and provision of his love, to which all things from the beginning of the Creation have conspired to give its foreseen development and effect; and if, from among Men, it has led to his selection of one individual, or one nation, for an especial honour which in his wisdom He has not intrusted to another—these have been *vessels of mercy*, not more unto themselves than unto others; God having provided for those also, who through their instrumentality should believe on Him; and so provided, that without this *crown of rejoicing*, not even his most favoured servants should be perfect in his sight. \* \* \* \*

“ What, then—if this be indeed St. Paul's doctrine of Predestination; if our *election of God*, so far as that grace is given to individual believers, resolves itself into this; *not that we have already attained unto it, or are already perfect*; but that with full purpose of heart, answering however faintly, to the fulness of the Divine purpose towards us, we are aiming *on our part to lay hold upon that blessed hope, for which we believe* (and, according to our faith, so shall we find) that *Christ's helping hand has laid hold on us*—if, while we so believe, and so *taste of the heavenly gift*, we are, in the truest sense, *of the seed of Abraham, and heirs to the full extent of the promise*; and yet so free is man's own agency in this matter, that he who ministerially has been *a vessel of election* unto others, may himself *fall from grace*, nay, in the end, be found to *be a castaway*—what shall we say, then, of more recent speculations on this subject?”

After a further exposition of his views, too long to extract, the author proceeds as follows:—

“ Such—under the teaching of that abiding Comforter who guided Paul *into all the truth, as it is in Jesus*—are the views which with ever-increasing clearness have unfolded themselves to one, neither wholly *unlearned*, nor (if he knows himself) *unstable*, student of the Original Text of the Christian Scriptures: and, as such, in meekness they are commended to all who will search those Scriptures, as followers neither of Calvin, nor of Arminius; but *as followers of Paul, even as Paul was of Christ*.”

These last words contain the only notice taken of the rival of the Calvinistic scheme. We mention this circumstance, in passing, to show that the author is consistent throughout in professing a freedom from the thralldom of system. There is also less reason for a formal dealing with Arminianism than with its opponent, because the term has come to be so widely used as a mere negation of the contrary doctrine. The thing must also be regarded as modern, when viewed as a fully-organized system and a polemical engine; though opinions symbolizing with it were vehemently combated by Origen, and may be recognized in the language of Clement of Alexandria. Calvinism, however, could not well have been thus passed over, because it may be regarded as fixing its impress upon the minds of almost all who come to the study of the New Testament, in the shape either of a favourable disposition towards such opinions, or of a feeling, that, however erroneous, still its pretensions are not to be dissipated with a breath.

We must now endeavour, as well as may be, to give, by a few selected annotations, an idea of the whole; a task of some little difficulty in works of this kind, and especially in one marked by what will doubtless be justly viewed by many as a prime excellence—brevity and compression, without resulting obscurity. In fact, it is quite divested of all cumbrous and superfluous matter, dealing not at all in the discursive, and sparingly in illustration: indeed, on this latter point, we could almost wish that Dr. Peile had drawn rather more upon stores which he can so well command.

On Chap. ii. 15, Dr. Peile renders, "*Inasmuch as they exhibit what really amounts to a revealed law written in their hearts.*" We quote this rendering, because it adopts a signification for *ἔργον*, in the phrase *τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου*, on which the Lexicons to the New Testament do not appear to have adventured; making it equivalent to "truth," "pith," "substance." No passage is cited in support of this meaning, and we are of opinion that but few could be found. We give, however, one authority, for the confirmation of the reader, in the expression, *τῆς αἰτίας τὸ ἔργον*. —Æschin. Ctesiph. p. 86. This signification is, indeed, urged upon us by the scope of the passage, but this alone might not be deemed sufficient to justify its adoption: when, however, its legitimacy is thus capable of establishment, the appearance of boldness which it may at first sight wear, is suited to give the reader a feeling of general confidence in the judgment and accuracy of the annotation. How different in spirit, too, is such a method from a convenient disposal of the expression, Lexicon

fashion, by the side-wind of pleonasm, making τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου a cumbrous equivalent to τὸν νόμον.

Chap. iii. 22.—“*A righteousness, I say (δὲ), which God hath appointed to be through the instrumentality of faith in Jesus Christ, designed for (εἰς) all, and realized unto (ἐπὶ, brought home to) all who truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel.*” The peculiarity which deserves notice in this translation is, that the expression εἰς πάντας is treated as complete in itself, and both separate and distinct in meaning from ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. The signification here assigned to εἰς is too common, both in the New Testament and elsewhere, to need exemplification: for an illustration of the force of ἐπὶ, reference may be made to Luke vi. 35. An expression is thus clearly brought out, from the Apostle’s language, of an unlimited applicability of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, on the one hand, and, on the other, its actually limited application, together with the regulating principle of the limitation; an expression of which the dogmatic importance is obvious. The strictly verbal rendering of the English Bible, “*unto all and upon all them that believe,*” cannot be said to convey a very distinct idea; the defect, however, being derived solely from the nature of that translation, as being of necessity rigidly literal; a consideration which ought to be generalized and ever remembered by those who are disposed to entertain strong notions of its capabilities of amendment. The rendering of the Vulgate, “*in omnes et super omnes qui credunt in eum,*” is still less effective. One cannot but contrast, too, a strange laxity in ancient times with regard to the original language of this passage, since the words καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας are altogether omitted by many authorities of Alexandrian connexion. — One sign, by the way, among many, that the text of the New Testament was in less safe keeping in that quarter than elsewhere while Chrysostom (Hom. in Matt. xxii. ad fin.) and, after him, Theodoret quote them where they have neither place nor force, namely, in chap. x. 12, of this epistle.

Chap. vii. 15. “*οὐ γινώσκω, I allow not—I do not own, or recognize as my own* : an Hebraical and Hellenistic use of this verb according to Parkhurst, who compares Matt. vii. 23. John viii. 53. x. 14, 15. xvii. 3. 25. 1 Cor. viii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 19.” As some of the passages here cited from Parkhurst may not be deemed decisive, we add references from the Old Testament, Ps. cxlv. 3. Amos iii. 2. Nahum i. 7. And here we would take occasion to urge upon those who are approaching the study of the New Testament, the prime importance of a constant and attentive use of the Septuagint and the Apocrypha, assuring them of

the abundance of light which may be thence derived; and that without an acquaintance with those writings, the soundest classical scholarship will be in danger of tripping on the ground of the Greek Testament. The annotations on the important eight and ninth chapters, scarcely admit of being dealt fairly with by brief extracts; we therefore recommend their matter in general to a careful consideration, as being itself the fruit of care and patient thought. It is worth while, however, to detach the following note on chap. ix. 21.

“It is not a little surprising that, among the numerous Commentators on this Epistle, no one (so far as I know) has thought of applying here the same principle of interpretation as has been almost universally allowed in ver. 13; viz., that, as ἐμίσησα implies no more than the *absence*, in the earthly condition of Esau, of that special favour which God was pleased to manifest towards the patriarch Jacob; so εἰς ἀριμίαν implies no more than the *absence* of that distinction or pre-eminence, for which, in the hands of their Potter (Isa. lxiv. 8), this or that among the nations of the world may be designed.”

There can be no reasonable doubt of the propriety of recognizing in ver. 13 the Hebraic usage, which consists in the artificial production of a perfect antithesis by a slight exaggeration in the terms of one of two contrasted members of a sentence; and the note is valuable to the interpreter, as pointing out its equal applicability to another passage of considerable moment as respects the dogmatic purport of the Epistle.

Chap. viii. 20. “*For the human creation became subject to vanity—not by its own act, but through his doing who occasioned its subjection—with a sustaining hope,*” &c. For a confirmation of the rendering here given to the expression ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι, and of one still stronger, which might well have been adopted, recourse must be had to the Septuagint, compared with the original; where see Psalm iv. 10. lxxviii. 58. Prov. i. 33. Hos. ii. 18. The same usage is observable in chap. iv. 19, of this Epistle, where the words ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν may be rendered, ‘believed with firm assurance.’ See also Acts ii. 26. 1 Cor. ix. 10.

On chap. ix. 11, exception is taken to the rendering given by the English Bible of the words, ἵνα ἡ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόθεσις μὲνῃ, on the ground that the collocation of the Greek is adverse to it. The objection is, no doubt, sound in itself, and is an instance of the annotator’s habit of exact observation and scrupulous accuracy. Still it may be regarded as certain, that the order of the words in the common text is wrong, and that they should stand, ἡ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ Θεοῦ; and thus the signification of the clause will be, ‘in order that God’s pur-

idea of acting on a principle of election. should stand for—  
not originating not from them: a work of will in time.

Chap. 2. 1. "For the very construction and dependence of the  
subject of the sentence (justification of accounts & such like)  
there is to every individual believer or *His*." In view of the  
Apostle's meaning expressed by this rendering, seen to be the  
same in effect with Chrysostom's, whose words are: τὸ  
κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἔστιν, ὅτι οἱ μὲν οὐκ αὐτοὶ ἐκλεχθέντες, ἀλλ' ἐκ  
ἐκείνων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπαρῶν λέγει, ὅτι  
ἐκείνη ἡ ἐκλογή ποτε τῷ πιστεύοντι. Rom. 11. 2. 3. 4.  
We have quoted these words, in order that in some  
places might not by chance appear to any one more and more  
portent, when ranged with the various meanings which the  
many and variety of interpreters have elicited from the text.  
While making these few extracts, in order to furnish some  
of forming an idea of the nature and execution of the work we  
have felt pleasure in subjoining to them something in connection  
with it. We now proceed to notice a passage where we feel the  
need to differ from the author: but we do it in the same spirit  
because we think that he has there thrown away an important  
important for the establishment and illustration of his views.

Chap. 2. 2. "God hath not cast off His people, understanding  
thereby that true and spiritual Israel, known only to Himself  
from as made one with Christ, *He from the beginning created  
and approved.*" We make no objection to this interpretation  
considered in itself; but, since it introduces an extraneous  
subject, namely, the spiritual Israel in the very midst of a con-  
text which is solely occupied with Israel after the flesh, we  
cannot but consider that τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ means the same thing  
here as in the first verse of the chapter. The following is our  
view of the purport of the entire passage. The Apostle com-  
mences with a question to this effect: "Has God subjected  
Israel to an indiscriminate rejection?" To this he gives an  
earnest negative; appealing to his own case, inasmuch as,  
though an Apostle of Christ, he was a true Israelite by blood.  
He then repeats the denial: "No, God has not cast away his  
people—the people whom He foreknew." He proceeds further  
to the same effect, by intimating that a presumption similar to  
that of Elijah, that Israel was totally apostate, would be equally  
erroneous; since a portion—a mere fragment indeed—(λείμμα)  
were actually within the pale of a new "election of free favour,"  
which, while it freely embraced the Gentile, did not exclude the  
Jew. According to this view of the passage, the family of  
Israel in the mass was the object of the action, whatever it was,  
signified by the term προέγνω; and therefore an action of the

same kind, *mutatis mutandis*, must be understood when the term is elsewhere applied to the spiritual Israel (viii. 29), the new election, of which the former one was a type. We shall not follow out the interpretation of the term which is thus indicated, but merely observe, that, as the former action was directed, not to individuals, but to a collective body, the same must be understood of the latter.

Among the requisites for an exact interpretation of this Epistle, is one which, though too often neglected, will not now be questioned; we mean a due attention to the distinctive use of νόμος and ὁ νόμος. This point, it is evident, Dr. Peile has kept steadily in view throughout, and has exercised upon it the fullest consideration. In calling attention, however, to this matter, under a conviction of its importance, we will here suggest a double practical caution; as follows: since there existed only one written code of law possessed of divine authority, a person in the situation of the Apostle might sometimes be led to frame a proposition with the particular term, where the conception might be rightly extended to the general one; and, on the other hand, might truly use the general term, though with an eye and actual reference only to the Mosaic Law (ὁ νόμος). Besides the obvious signification of the term ὁ νόμος, Dr. Peile has, in several passages, attached another meaning to it, which we will give in his own words. With a reference to Bp. Middleton's *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, ch. ii., he explains οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου (ii. 13) thus: "*The hearers of the law*, in any particular case to which we may apply the general description, ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, in the preceding verse—not necessarily, therefore, *the law of Moses*, nor, as Macknight explains it, *the law of faith*; but *what we assume in any case to be the law under which men have sinned*." The next verse is also thus translated: "*For as often as heathens which have no revealed law do by the light of nature what a law assumed to exist among them would instruct them to do*," &c. The same view is adopted by the author in ch. iv. 15, and we have deemed it just to bring it into prominent notice. If, however, any of his readers should not feel encouraged to follow him, the former part of the caution given above may come to their aid, and supply a method of accounting for the presence of the article. In ver. 13, indeed, it might be referred to the peculiar usage which is exemplified in ch. ix. 21 of this Epistle, Luke xii. 39. John xvi. 21, and elsewhere.

There are one or two passages of acknowledged difficulty, where our own view of their signification differs partially from that of Dr. Peile; but even there we cannot but feel, notwithstanding, that what he has brought forward merits respectful and close



attention. This the work claims throughout, as being composed in an independent and self-confiding spirit, free, at the same time, from the love of novelty and paradox. As such, it cannot fail to be serviceable, whether to those students who are mainly occupied with the simple text; or, on the other hand, to such as have before them an accumulation of exegetical and illustrative matter, to guide and help their progress through materials which may often prove mazy—at times, perhaps, somewhat chaotic. If any one, too, be disposed to lament that he is not possessed of such a store, he may here learn how much may be achieved by simpler means. To affirm that, in order to work out a sound interpretation, we must begin with Greek scholarship, is to give but a faint representation of the truth of the case, since here, as elsewhere, *Dimidium facti qui cœpit habet.*

In taking leave of Dr. Peile, we turn, for a moment, to the title-page of his book, where we find it described as *designed chiefly for the use of students of the Greek Text.* We will not here merely subjoin a routine wish, that it may benefit that class of persons, but rather express a hope that it may be the means of increasing their number. For the realization of such a hope, we must admit that there is, unfortunately, too much room, when we consider with how large a portion of those who are professionally occupied with the New Testament—not to mention the Old—the translation is the thing of ordinary use, and the original, the object of occasional, and even rare recurrence; a practice which ceases to appear preposterous only because it is familiar. An old writer quaintly observes, “Truly translations are generally like the wrong side of arras-hangings;” and if this is necessarily true in the case of Homer or Æschylus, it is also true with respect to St. Paul. If we carry out the similitude, we must describe the practice to which we have alluded, as a contentedness with a faint and ambiguous portraiture, occasionally enlivened by an inspection of the brighter colours and clearer outline, equally within reach on the other side of the fabric. We would not, however, be thought to treat a subject so solemn as this becomes when the volume of Scripture is concerned, otherwise than in the gravest and most earnest tone; and therefore we hold it our duty to sympathise with one who, like our author, comes forward, with the best fruits of learning and labour, to guide, aid, and encourage others in aspiring to an attainment than which, we believe, he himself deems none more worthy of intellectual toil; his, namely, who is truly μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὅμοιος ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά.



- ART. III.—1.** *Concio ad Clerum Provinciæ Cantuar. In æde Paulina habita xix die Novembr. 1847 à RICARDO GULIELMO JELF, S.T.P., Ædis Christi Canonico, necnon Collegii Reg. Londin. Principali, &c. Jussu Reverendissimi.* Oxford: J. H. Parker.
- 2.** *The English Churchman, Thursday, Dec. 2, 1847.*
- 3.** *A Letter to Lord John Russell, M.P. On the bearing which the proposed admission of Jews into Parliament, the nomination of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford, and other acts of Government, have on the Revival of Convocation. By the Rev. W. J. TROWER, Rector of Wiston, Sussex, Rural Dean.* London: Rivingtons.
- 4.** *Church Schools and State Interference. A Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. By GEORGE A. DENISON, M.A., Vicar of East Brent, Prebendary of Salisbury, &c.* London: Rivingtons.
- 5.** *Church Emancipation and Church Reform, in a Series of Letters addressed to the Churchmen of England. By ECCLESIASTES. Reprinted from the "Morning Herald."* London: Hatchards.

THE question of the expediency of permitting the convocation to meet for the despatch of business, has of late attracted a considerable share of the attention of the Church; and as far as we have been enabled to judge, there is a rapidly-growing conviction in the minds of all classes, that the time has arrived in which it would be conducive to the welfare of the Church and of the sacred interests entrusted to her care, to bring into immediate action her synodical powers. We have ourselves, after much deliberation, arrived at this conclusion; though we were formerly apprehensive, that the meeting of convocation might be attended with evils to the Church.

There are two parties to be considered in reference to the meeting of convocation—the Church, and the State. These parties will contemplate the subject from different points of view, and be actuated by different motives. We shall here only consider the question as it regards the Church; because if the Church is united in this or any other religious question, the State cannot, and will not refuse her petitions. The changes

which have occurred in our civil constitution, give to any powerful interest in the State facilities for pushing and succeeding in almost any claims that they may make. As the Church of England is, by far, *the most numerous and powerful body in the State*, it simply remains with her to pronounce her united decision on any point connected with her own rights, and to press that point with sufficient perseverance and unanimity on the legislature, in order to be assured of success.

Putting aside, therefore, any reference to the inclinations or wishes of statesmen or political parties, as matters of minor importance, we are about to state the reasons which induce us to desire the meeting of convocation for the despatch of business; and we shall also consider the objections which are usually offered to that measure.

Some persons, in their advocacy of the revival of convocation, have taken positions which cannot be admitted by any one who is conversant with Church history. According to them, no laws whatever can be made in the discipline of the Church, or on other matters immediately affecting her, unless a convocation or synod shall have, at least, sanctioned and approved those laws. This ground is not unfrequently taken; but it seems to us altogether untenable, unless we are prepared to condemn many enactments which have been made in this Church from the period of the Reformation to the present day, (and which are actually parts of our ecclesiastical law,) as having proceeded from an incompetent authority. In fact, even Romanists admit, that the intervention of a synod is not absolutely necessary to the enactment of laws on matters of faith and discipline. A decree of the Pope of Rome, *universally received in the Church*, is to them, the substitute for synodical enactments. And in reference to the enactments of the temporal power in England on spiritual matters, the reception of such enactments by the Church at large, seem to us to constitute them in effect the laws of the Church herself.

While, however, we cannot maintain, that the resumption of the direct legislative powers of the Church is simply and absolutely essential to the enactment of laws affecting the Church, we can see many reasons, which, in our judgment, render that revival eminently expedient and desirable.

In the first place, the composition of the House of Commons, in virtue of the acts of 1828 and 1829, is such as plainly to render it unfit for the consideration of many ecclesiastical subjects. A body which now comprises a large body of Romanists, many dissenters, and which will probably include Jews and infidels, is not a proper tribunal for the consideration of Church

subjects. To exclude such persons from their discussion would be impossible; and yet it is unjust in itself, and offensive to the Church, that persons of a different religion should have any part in legislating for her. But, besides this, the House of Commons is not calculated, from the nature of the attainments of its members, to form a sound judgment on measures affecting the discipline of the Church. None of the clergy are allowed to occupy seats in the House of Commons; so that all its members are laymen, many of them not even members of the Church, and who, without implying any disrespect to them, are not so much acquainted with Church subjects as the clergy ought at least to be. In addition to this, the continually increasing burden of business on secular matters in the House of Commons, renders it impossible for that body to give the necessary time and care to the consideration of Church subjects. The most important bills on such matters might be brought in session after session without ever passing, from the mere press of business; even if there were no other obstacle.

All this seems to render parliament in these days a very unfit legislative body for the Church. In fact, Church legislation is, in a great degree, prevented by the present arrangements; for there are many subjects of very high importance, which are of too sacred a character to be submitted to an assembly composed of religionists of all kinds, and which, yet, *ought* to be in some way legislated upon, with a view to the welfare of religion, and the security of the Church. The House of Commons might, without marked and glaring impropriety, discuss such matters as the temporalities of the Church, the erection of episcopal sees, the diminution in the number of sinecures, non-residence, and pluralities, and such other mere external matters; but when questions arise on matters affecting internal discipline, or on morality or faith, it is impossible to submit them to the House of Commons; and there is then no possibility of legislating at all on such matters.

In the next place, the assembling of synods for mutual counsel on questions affecting religion, is an apostolical practice. There is even a special promise in the Gospel to those who are gathered together in the Lord's name. It is, of course, true, that such assemblies have made mistakes before now; still, this does not furnish any valid objection to them in general. *Parliaments* have at times legislated injudiciously; yet this is not a reason against assembling them. The question is, whether Church synods are not beneficial and necessary, notwithstanding any mistakes to which they may be liable. That they *are* useful, may be inferred from their general adoption in all ages of the Church,

and by sects of all denominations. The various religious bodies in England and Ireland external to the Church have their synods. The Romish prelates assemble and enact regulations. The Presbyterians, Free Kirk, Congregationalists, Wesleyans, &c., have all their synods. The American, and the Scottish Church, have their convention and synod. All of these societies have differences amongst their members. They are liable to occasional disturbances in their synodical meetings; and yet they feel the advantage of such meetings, and continually hold them. And we must here add, that those bodies are generally less disturbed at present than the Church of England is, notwithstanding the disputes which sometimes occur in their synods.

In the third place, it seems to us that the disuse of synods in the English Church has tended to create parties and controversies. In the absence of any legitimate and ordinary mode of promoting objects conceived to be desirable for the welfare of the Church, zealous persons have been led to form themselves into combinations and parties, for the purpose of attaining their objects by influencing the public mind, and the legislature, or the heads of the Church; and this has led to counter-movements. Thus the Church has become divided from the want of its legitimate tribunal for the decision of such questions; and anxiety, dissension, and trouble of all kinds, have arisen to the heads of the Church, to a *far greater extent*, we believe, than would have been the case if convocations had been sitting. To take the case of the Oxford controversy, we believe that if convocation had been sitting, the whole controversy would have been settled far sooner and more effectually than it was: indeed, we believe that the Oxford movement would never have taken the course it did. It arose very much from a feeling of the want of any such point of union in the Church—from a sense of the powerlessness of the Church to resist fatal innovations; and, notwithstanding all the errors and extravagances which have arisen in the course of that movement, and the miserable end of one section of it, we do not hesitate to express our conviction that the discussions to which it has given rise have been highly beneficial to the Church, and that she has been braced and invigorated, and to a great extent purified from secularity amidst the storms of the last ten years. The Church has now only to advance steadily, on her own distinctive principles—the principles of God's most holy Word; and she will, with God's blessing, vanquish every opponent who may be in her path.

In the next place, we advocate the restoration of convocation, because there are questions of considerable difficulty continually arising, in the present awakened condition of the Church, which

are of very great importance, and which it is undesirable to leave to the decision of particular bishops. In matters affecting discipline, doctrine, Divine worship, a bishop is sometimes called upon to pronounce his single and unaided decision. He incurs a very serious responsibility in so doing. He has to decide, on his own judgment, and his own responsibility, questions perhaps of very great nicety and delicacy—questions also of very high importance—questions on which the public mind is intently fixed, and on which any injudicious judgment may do an infinity of harm: and then, besides this, the judgment, when passed, is not actually binding in many cases, and it may be counteracted by some adverse decision or opinion of another prelate. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury has no positive *power* in such matters beyond any other bishop. Now we submit, to the members of the Church generally, that there is an obvious defect in such a system; in point of fact, it greatly increases the anxiety and the difficulties of the episcopal office. On the other hand, if a bishop were enabled to lay such cases as we have alluded to before convocation, and to obtain deliberate legislation on the subject, much thought and anxiety would be avoided, his responsibility would be infinitely lessened, and the possibility of hasty and injudicious acts would be obviated. Any decision would come armed with a moral weight and a legal authority, which it would be impossible to resist. In this point of view, therefore, we think that convocation would be found practically to diminish the difficulties experienced by bishops, and to promote the union of the Church.

In addition to this, we think that the spirit and character of the Church in general at present ought to be taken into account. There is, we think, a great respect for constituted authorities—we may say, an *increasing* respect; but, on the other hand, there is a great deal of mental activity, a great increase in that kind of knowledge which enables men to examine and discuss ecclesiastical topics, and to sift and examine principles. There is also—and it is a necessary accompaniment of such a mental condition as we have referred to—an indisposition to approve any exercise of mere arbitrary and irresponsible power. With all the respect which is generally entertained for constituted authority, and with the earnest wish and longing for the exercise of its powers which exists, there is also a repugnance to any exercise of those powers which seems founded on mere individual judgment, or which is not supported by solid and well-weighed reasons. Authority, in the present day, requires the support of reason and principle; its enactments require full previous discussion: therefore, we think that decisions made in convocation, after full

opportunity had been afforded for deliberation and discussion; and examination of their details, would be more generally satisfactory, and in the end more conducive to the peace and the unanimity of the Church than any decisions made by individual prelates.

In the next place, we think that convocation would be more satisfactory to the Church generally, as a legislative body, than a synod consisting merely of bishops. There is this great distinction between the ancient synods and any such modern synod—in the former, the bishops were not merely representatives of the apostles, but, as a body, they were representatives of the clergy and laity; they were *elected to their offices by the clergy and people*.

Now this gave them, of course, a peculiar and special authority, which bishops appointed merely by the State, cannot possess. The Church at large was satisfied with the composition of the ancient synods, which, for the most part, consisted only of bishops; because they felt that the bishops were really the *representatives* of their clergy and people; but it does not follow, that the Church would be equally satisfied now, with synods consisting simply of bishops, in whose appointment the Church has really had no part. Those bishops may be revered for their apostolical office, and for their personal character; but still they are not representatives of the Church at large, as their predecessors, in ancient times, were; and a synod consisting solely of such bishops, would scarcely realize the full idea and notion of the early synods. It would not correspond to the apostolical synod held on the question of legal rites; and we feel convinced, from all that is passing before our eyes, that it would not give satisfaction to the Church generally. The very demand for convocation is a token that something more is requisite than a mere episcopal synod. Now, under all these circumstances, we are of opinion, that convocation is a body, which, in its general features, is adapted to the wants of the Church in this empire. There is, in convocation, a fair *representation* of the Church. The bishops constitute one house, and no measure can be passed without their consent. The representatives of the clergy constitute another house, and their consent is also requisite. There is full opportunity for the examination and discussion of any measures proposed. We apprehend that a convocation, constituted in general as it is at present, would be satisfactory to the infinite majority of the Church. We do not ourselves see any objection in point of principle to the introduction of deputies from the laity of the Church; but we see some difficulties, practically, in any such arrangement, both with reference to the mode of electing such deputies, and with reference to the increase of numbers in



the lower house, which would thence arise. We should not anticipate evil, but good, in many respects, if lay deputies could, on really good and sound principles of selection, be admitted to the lower house. The system does not work usefully in the American Church; and there can be no doubt of its adding largely to the power and influence of convocation. This, however, is a point which might, very fairly, come under the consideration of convocation itself; and which would probably be fully examined. The convocation would, in its proceedings, be seen by the laity to act for the general welfare of the Church.

In addition to this, when we look at the persons who would constitute the lower house of convocation, we certainly feel confident, that while there would be full scope given to discussion, and while there would be active and zealous minds which would endeavour to push forward measures of a very important character, there would also be so much of gravity, experience, and discretion, as would, in almost all cases, prevent the passing of any measures of an objectionable character. It is possible, that a few persons of extreme opinions, in one direction or another, might be returned as proctors of the clergy; but from actual experience, and from the character of the great body of the clergy, we think there is every reason to anticipate the election of such proctors, in general, as would oppose measures of a dangerous character. In the archdeacons, again, who compose so very large a part of the lower house—in the representatives of chapters, at present at least—there is a body which would interpose a check to any extravagancies of individuals. It is possible, we admit, that some one or more persons might be so unwise as to propose alterations in the formularies of the Church, to meet their views on regeneration; or that others might propose something of a Romish tendency. But we do not see the slightest reason for thinking that such wild proposals would meet with general support. They would be borne down by the general sense and principles of convocation. And again, if any measure of questionable utility should pass the lower house of convocation, the house of bishops would have the power of rejecting or modifying it; and as we hope to see the day when *eighty or a hundred bishops* will sit in that house, they need not fear to exercise their prerogative in the fullest and amplest manner.

Besides this, we think that the State would derive benefit from the resumption of the deliberations of convocation. As it is, there is a feeling of extreme jealousy on the part of a considerable and influential body of churchmen at the interference of parliament in Church matters. Where such matters relate even merely to the temporalities of the Church, there is some danger of



a collision ; but when the State acts on points affecting education, and the discipline of the Church, there is considerable risk of serious differences. The Church has power, when she chooses to employ it. Ministries and political parties have suffered before now, in consequence of their attempting to force measures without regard to the principles and the feelings of the Church. In these times it is impossible to attempt to rule the Church on the maxims of Henry VIII. or Elizabeth. The executive government does not possess the power to carry measures in opposition to public opinion. It is forced to consult the wishes of those for whom it legislates. Now, as matters stand, we judge *from experience*, that the mere consultation of government with *the Heads of the Church*, is not sufficient to ensure the consent of the Church generally. Something more is requisite. It is felt that the heads of the Church are, from their position, so much under the influence of government, that they are liable to view questions too much on one side ; and dissatisfaction is generally felt at the notion of practically confiding the management of the Church to a very few prelates, and to her Majesty's ministers. We feel assured that a more amicable relation between the Church and State would be promoted, and less risk of collision would be run, if the government would fairly and frankly put before the Church assembled in convocation all measures affecting her internal discipline or her office as teacher of the people. To attempt to *force* measures on the Church which are unpalatable to her, would be highly impolitic ; and it would be altogether inconsistent with the spirit of modern legislation, and of religious liberty, which all politicians are now so desirous of promoting. The Church *will* have a voice in such questions ; she cannot be prevented, under the forms of our constitution, from using it. Why, then, should she not be permitted to do so, in a deliberative assembly, and in a regular and orderly manner, instead of becoming excited and agitated by the apprehension of wrong and injustice ?

These are some of the grounds on which we have arrived at the conclusion, that convocation ought to be permitted to resume its deliberations. The subject is one of very high importance, and deserves the fullest and calmest consideration from churchmen. We are fully aware of the difficulties of various kinds which, at first sight, present themselves. But we think that those difficulties, whatever they may be, ought not to prevent the attempt from being made. The objections which Dr. Jelf has so well urged in his sermon before the convocation of Canterbury, at its late meeting, are familiar to us ; but we confess that they do not appear to us to have any real force. They are grounded generally on difficulties in detail, and in the actual working of

convocation ; and the much respected author looks to the time when that assembly may be safely permitted to resume its work. We should not have recommended the deliberations of convocation a few years since, when controversy was raging in all parts of the Church, and when parties were armed almost to mutual extermination ; but we think that the present state of the Church is widely different. The separation of certain members of the Church who had been creating unceasing irritation within its communion, has gradually restored peace. It has withdrawn an influence which was not favourable to the growth of habits of fidelity to the Church, or of Christian humility ; and the effect has been to chasten and subdue many an ardent mind, which in its too confiding nature had been pushed beyond the bounds of Christian moderation. The effects of this secession have been seen in a gradual clearing of the heated and darkened atmosphere which had gathered around us, charged with elements of danger and convulsion. It is the hand of God which has affected this tranquillizing of the elements ; and we can see with gratitude the breaking in of a prospect which we had long sought for—the prospect of a united Church—a Church engaged in warfare only against the spirit of this world, and the various forms of error and sin which surround her—a Church which can combine steadfastness of faith with toleration of individual opinions. We think we can distinctly see before us the approach of such a state of things, amidst the many temporary clouds which beset the Church's path. And we believe that if it were wished to put a final end to the baneful influence of religious party, no more effectual way could be found, than to call in the aid of convocation. Men's minds would be then directed from the interests of their own little coteries, to the broader and more important field of the gathered Church. They might seek to introduce their own views there ; but they would soon find, that party views would not gain acceptance in that solemn assembly. The convocation would, we feel convinced, prove a rock, against which the efforts of party would be directed in vain, until party fell, silenced, and in despair. The apprehensions which haunt the minds of some excellent men, in reference to the struggles of party in convocation, would, we feel assured, vanish, after they had witnessed its actual working. We ask of them to look simply at the composition of that assembly. Would the majority of it be under the influence of any violent party ? Would the majority consent to any extravagant measures ? Surely not. We say, without fear or doubt, that the vast majority would consist of men of moderate views, like those of the author of the sermon before convocation. Would the clergy return violent men ? Assuredly not. The

clergy are not, generally, men of extreme opinions. And if a few men of extreme opinions, or of violence, should obtain admission, what evil, practically, could result, when the vast majority were men of altogether a different stamp? We really think, that this difficulty needs only to be looked at closely and *practically*, in order to be assured that it ought not to prevent the assembling of convocation.

Now, to come to another objection, which has been raised—the occurrence of serious divisions in councils, and their occasional uselessness in times of controversy. It is very true that times have occurred, in which the action of the Church has been almost suspended in a kind of syncope, and all ordinary expedients for restoring the use of her vital functions seem to fail for the moment. Such was the Arian controversy, chiefly through the interference of the *State*, which embarrassed and embroiled matters so much, by interfering with the free expression of the Church's opinions, that men hardly knew for a time what course to take, and every man's hand was against his brother. In the heat and fury of controversy, it may sometimes happen that synods will not appease men's minds—that they may be themselves under the influence of heat and party feeling. Mistakes have certainly been made by synods before now. Every institution, in which human beings are the agents, will be at times liable to imperfections and temporary aberrations. But still this should not militate against the institutions themselves. They may be useful notwithstanding. Convocations have done good service to the Church of England before now, though they have been in fault. The divisions between the two houses in the early part of the eighteenth century have been referred to, as showing the danger of collisions. This was a case in which convocation had been suspended for a long series of years, and in which its working was not understood: in such a case the legislature ought to have interfered, and given the crown power to regulate such matters of mere external privilege, as constituted the grounds of debate. The upper house and the lower were at issue on points of privilege; and in this case the State should have interfered to preserve peace and order. Constantine the Great, and the succeeding Christian emperors, always took care that order should be preserved in the deliberations of synods. The Archbishop of Canterbury of the day ought to have invoked the aid of the civil power to terminate these differences, and permit the convocation to discharge its functions undisturbed. And again, with regard to Bishop Hoadley—what harm could the condemnation of Hoadley have done to the Church or the State? Supposing the lower house of convocation to bring articles of accusation against a bishop, or to censure his writings or opinions,

great harm can result except to the individual! If the lower house should acquit the accused prelate, the cause is at an end.

If it should condemn and depose him, it could not injure the Church. Bishops have been often deposed before now; and are liable to deposition just as much as the inferior clergy.

Very probably the government, in the time of Bishop Hurd, may have looked with jealousy on the lower house of Convocation, as not well affected to the Hanoverian succession. It may have supposed the attack on him to have been stimulated by Jacobite feeling; but it was a very unwise expedient to suppress entirely the meetings of convocation, instead of attempting to remedy the defects in its constitution. Without doubt the experiment succeeded after a time in damping the zeal of the clergy. A season of deadness came. The Church remained passively in the hands of government for many years; but that season of deadness and passive acquiescence is gone, never to return again. The State is now more open to popular influences, and the Church will infallibly have influence on any point in which it chooses to exercise it. If there are not disputes in convocation, there will be disputes, and greater disputes, out of it. It is no longer possible by the mere system of doing nothing, to keep the Church in order.

Again, it is objected to the convocation, that, as at present constituted, it is not a national synod, and is therefore incompetent to legislate for the whole united Church of England and Ireland. We admit the force of this objection; but, then, *why did not the convocation be made national?* We cannot see the slightest difficulty in uniting the convocation of York to that of Salisbury, and in permitting the Irish convocation to send deputies in proportion to the numbers of the Irish clergy. This would make a national synod; of which all colonial bishops might be members, while all other bishops in communion with the Church might sit in the upper house without the right of voting. The Irish bishops would, of course, be members of the upper house; the clergy being 2000 in number, their convocation might elect deputies to the extent of one-sixth of the number of lay members of the lower house of convocation. If there were a wish to form a national synod, it could be very easily done. The Crown has the power to do so without any appeal to parliament, we believe; but it would be easy to take the necessary powers, or to provide for the enactment of orders for the proceedings of the assembly. These are mere matters of detail, which could be settled without the slightest difficulty.

We are persuaded that too many of our best men are in the habit of making mountains out of mole-hills. They are deterred

from accomplishing great objects by vague fears and apprehensions, derived from times when the whole state of things was widely different from what it now is. We can most fully and cordially sympathize with those who are thus influenced, because we know the extreme difficulty of getting over such vague fears; and we also are aware that they arise from a conscientious feeling, and from anxiety for the welfare of the Church; but, we repeat, that it is our conviction, that the time has passed by, in which the real welfare of the Church can be promoted by sitting still, and doing nothing in matters of such importance as this.

Without doubt, if convocation were permitted to act, there would be a considerable press of business for some time; and we can imagine that there are venerable men who would look, with some uneasiness, at the amount of pressure on their time and attention which might ensue, and which might seem to them almost beyond their energies; but, we apprehend, that the pressure would not, after all, be found so very great, as might be at first imagined. Convocation could not sit above a certain time. It would not be possible to remove the archdeacons and proctors from their parochial and other duties for lengthened periods. The sittings of convocation must, therefore, be of limited duration; and the pressure of legislation in any one year could not be very great: measures of less urgency or of difficulty would be deferred for future consideration. We should not anticipate any rapid settlement of important questions. Points of difficulty might be reserved for full and ample discussion; and the president of the synod would always have it in his power to give ample time for deliberation.

On the whole, therefore, we advocate the revival of convocation as a deliberative and legislative assembly; but so modified as to suit the circumstances of the times, and to enable it to work with harmony and efficiency.

We think that powers should be taken for uniting the convocation of York to that of Canterbury, for summoning the Irish convocation, and enabling it to send a certain number of deputies to the English synod, and for making such orders and regulations as to the mode of proceeding as would be necessary to provide for order and regularity, and to prevent collisions between the two houses. Of this general synod of the united Church, we would propose the Archbishop of Canterbury as president, who ought to be raised to the dignity of patriarch, in order to enable him to preside over all the archbishops and bishops of the united Church, and to issue his writ of summons to the whole. As "primate of all England," he would not have authority to preside in the

d of Ireland, but as "patriarch," he would hold a superior and power to that which he now holds, and which would place him above all archbishops and primates.

We do not know whether, in these days, any jealousy might exist in Ireland at the notion of subjecting the primate and bishops of Ireland to any English prelate; but if there should be so, we would say, that we do not purpose that the "primate of Ireland" should be subject to the "primate of England," who has certainly no right to exercise jurisdiction over Ireland, but to the "patriarch" of the whole united Church, including the English colonies in all parts of the world. It would, in our humble judgment, conduce to the safety of the Irish branch of the Church, if it were brought into more close connection with the English Church. The act for the legislative union of the two countries provided that the two Churches should be "united;" but except on paper, and in the eye of the law, they are not now more united than they were before the union. They are legally united, but this union is not practically carried out.

They are thoroughly independent of each other in all respects. We think that it would be for the benefit of the Irish Church to be included in any future arrangements for the English Church as far as possible. Nor do we see any reason why the Irish Church, if she chose to place herself under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Great Britain and Ireland, should be refused admission to the national synod.

We have been more particularly induced to give utterance to our opinions on this subject, by the circumstance of the assembling of the convocation on occasion of the summoning of a new parliament. We are aware that considerable anxiety has been expressed by numerous and influential bodies of clergy and laity on the subject of the meeting of convocation; and that petitions and memorials have been prepared and transmitted expressive of their wishes, that it may be permitted to enter on the discharge of its deliberative and legislative functions. We have not the least doubt, that the cause has been promoted by these expressions of opinion; but we think that the convocation itself, alone more to promote that cause, by its own proceedings, than any other advocate has yet accomplished. We have read, with unqualified gratification, the report of its proceedings, furnished to the pages of our able contemporary, "The Englishman," by some correspondent; which, brief and imperfect as it is, appears to us one of the most interesting documents that have come to light for years past. We offer no apology for transcribing to our pages the whole of this simple and unadorned nar-



rative, which bears all the impress of sincerity, and of the testimony of an eye-witness. Without the pompous diction, and the "sesquipedalia verba," which sometimes occur in the reports of old synods, this little narrative conveys to us all the notion of synodical proceedings, conducted with temper, wisdom, and charity:—

"The opening of the Holy Provincial Synod of Canterbury has appeared in the *English Churchman* of November 25th. We now proceed to give a sketch of the proceedings at the Jerusalem Chamber on Nov. 24th.

"His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury was present, supported by the Bishops of Winchester, Rochester, Salisbury, Oxford, St. Asaph, Exeter, &c. &c.

"Dr. Short, as the junior bishop, read the prayers.

"Dr. Spry presented the prolocutor, and Dean Lyall read a Latin speech touching upon points connected with the state of the Church, and saying that the present would be a favourable opportunity for the convocation to be allowed to act, as it would be under the presidency of his Grace, who had so long and so ably filled the archiepiscopal throne. His Grace approved of our choice, and complimented the prolocutor on the ability with which he had discharged the various duties to which he had been called.

"The lower house retired, and the prolocutor read the names of the clergy summoned.

"A complaint was made that, owing to the changes in the dioceses, some archdeaconries had lost their representatives.

"Dean Lyall said he had found some standing orders of the house regulating the mode in which the debates were to be carried on. Having read these, he appointed certain members to assist him in preserving order.

"A member proposed 'that an address should be presented to the upper house, asking their lordships to unite with the lower house in a humble petition to the Queen, praying for her royal licence that convocation might be permitted to consult upon the best means of increasing the efficiency of the Church.' He said that we were perfectly in order in presenting such an address; that this was one of the proper means of communicating to the upper house the wishes of the lower.

"This was seconded by ———, because, though he was not very sanguine about convocation, he knew that the clergy whom he represented wished that convocation might be allowed to act.

"Dr. ——— moved an amendment 'that a conference should be sought with the upper house;' he argued that in conference we should be better able to explain our wishes and wants than in an address.

"After this had been seconded, several members spoke for and



against the propositions. Some thought we had better wait for the bishop's address ; others said the advantage of the address or conference was, that their lordships would be able to insert our wishes in their address to the Sovereign, if they coincided with us.

" The amendment was put from the chair and lost.

" The original motion was put and lost also.

" An archdeacon wished to present a petition from the clergy of his archdeaconry on the subject of Dr. Hampden's rumoured nomination to the see of Hereford.

" The archdeacon of ———— thought we were not competent to receive petitions from the clergy, inasmuch as we ourselves were their representatives, and therefore competent to declare their wishes.

" Several concurred in this view.

" The prolocutor, being appealed to, said he knew of no precedent for receiving petitions, and the absence of a precedent in their favour was almost a precedent against receiving them.

" A proctor observed that the House of Commons were the representatives of the people, and yet that they received petitions from their constituents ; and that one reason why it might not be easy to find a precedent for our receiving petitions was, that the custom of petitioning had grown up since convocation was silenced.

" It was then proposed and seconded that the petition be read ; but, after some further discussion, it was withdrawn.

" Another petition for the increase of the episcopate and diaconate was presented, but this also was laid upon the table on the ground that as we were not certain we had the power of receiving petitions, we thought it better to leave the point undecided.

" It was mentioned that similar petitions had been forwarded to the upper house.

" A discussion arose as to whether the lower house could *originate* any thing,—whether, for instance, we could put any new matter into the address, or whether our power was confined to leaving out what we did not like, and putting a negative on the whole.

" This view found some advocates ; but it was said that new matter was proposed at the last convocation, and no objection was made on that score.

" A member observed that, as it was evident we were not sufficiently acquainted with the rights, and privileges, and powers of the lower house, we ought to be especially careful not to come to any resolution that might unduly restrict them ; he did not understand the feeling which led members to endeavour to diminish the little power still left convocation, and that we ought not to compliment away our rights.

" About two hours were occupied in these preliminary discussions. During this time the upper house had been engaged in preparing the address to the Queen.

" It was rumoured that a proposal, in favour of reviving the dry bones

of convocation, would be made in that house, as some of the bishops wished to see the Church's synod again in action.

"The prolocutor read the address, first through, then paragraph by paragraph. He said, if no observation is made, the paragraph will be considered to have passed; if any member wishes to move an amendment, he will have the opportunity.

"The address began thus:—'Madam,—On the last occasion of our meeting, we congratulated your Majesty on your alliance with a Prince, no less illustrious for his virtues than his descent, and on the birth of the Prince of Wales. We have now to express our happiness in seeing your Majesty surrounded by a family who would, we earnestly prayed, show in after life the fruits of their early training in sound wisdom and religion.'

"This met with universal approbation. All seemed to be of opinion that we could not be too thankful for the good example of domestic life, and attention to the duties of personal religion, set by the Queen and her Royal Consort.

"A paragraph followed, 'thanking her Majesty that, following the example of her predecessors, she had done so much for the Church, and acted so wisely and constitutionally.'

"A member asked what her Majesty's predecessors had done for the Church? He thought the Church had not much to thank them for; and that such ill-grounded compliments did more harm than good. Nor could he conscientiously agree in the expression, 'that the powers of the crown were in all cases exercised impartially and constitutionally,' so long as the synods of the Church of England were not permitted to meet. Not that he blamed the Sovereign for this; for he believed that the royal licence would not be refused, if the houses of convocation, and the Church in general, petitioned for it.

"Another member had previously expressed his conviction that though, according to the letter of the law, the Sovereign had the power to prorogue convocation from time to time, yet that it never was intended that this power should be exercised so as to prevent the Church's synod from consulting about the Church's welfare.

"The next paragraph congratulated her Majesty on the success that had followed the foreign policy of her ministers, in preserving peace amongst Christian nations, bringing the heathen into communication with Christian states, and teaching the European powers to act with Christian principle towards their subjects. Some objection was made to the war with China, and it was observed that the Poles did not seem to benefit much by any lessons we had taught their rulers. And it seemed the feeling of many present, that it was hardly fair to introduce such subjects, or to ask our concurrence in propositions, the drift of which was not very clear, and which might mean any thing or nothing.

"An archdeacon moved the insertion of a paragraph thanking her Majesty for the preservation of the ancient see of St. Asaph, and for

the establishment of the bishopric of Manchester, which we looked upon as an earnest of a still further increase in the number of our bishops, till they bore some proportion to the increase in the population.

“This was carried unanimously.

“The address then thanked her Majesty for the increase in the episcopacy abroad, and congratulated the Church that, by a liberality unexampled in these latter days, our Church had sent forth chief pastors into many distant lands. The expression, ‘our Church had sent forth,’ was found fault with, because, as convocation, which is the Church of England by representation, had not been consulted on these measures; they were the acts, not of the Church at large, but of the individuals who had assisted in them and sanctioned them.

“Many argued that this belonged to the bishops alone; but the objection was maintained on this ground, amongst others, that when the bishop of Australia made his noble protest against the intrusion of a Roman Catholic bishop into his diocese, he had said, ‘he could not silently permit any other bishop to usurp the power which the Church of England had invested him with, unless he were sent by the houses of convocation.’ It was answered that other bishops had been sent—not against the wishes of this prelate, but at his request.

“Here a clause was proposed to be inserted, which gave rise to a long debate. We cannot quote the words accurately, but we hope the mover will make them public.

“It was to this effect. We had heard with surprise and regret that the prime minister had recommended Dr. Hampden to succeed to the see of Hereford, as he laboured under the censure of the university of Oxford; and we earnestly prayed her Majesty not to issue the *congé d’élire*, till a competent and lawful tribunal had examined his opinions and pronounced sentence.

“The proposer supported his motion with earnestness and prudence. He considered the appointment of a person lying under the censure of such a body as the convocation of Oxford, most unwise and deplorable. If he were elected and consecrated, before he had cleared himself of the charge of unsoundness in the faith, it would be the greatest injury the Church had received for many generations. He believed that the Church at large would take up the question, and petition the Queen and the bishops; but in the mean time churchmen looked to convocation to move, and he thought we should not be doing our duty to God and His Church, if we did not do all in our power to prevent a person, labouring under so grave a suspicion of heresy, from being intruded on the Church.

“The motion was seconded by the archdeacon of ———.

“Several dignitaries agreed with what had been said in condemnation of the appointment, but they did not know whether we were competent to consider the subject till they had the Queen’s writ; and they certainly thought it would not be prudent to embark in it. It was said, many members evidently had a strong desire that convocation

should assemble for business, but moving in this matter would defeat their wishes. Others said convocation was the proper court to examine Dr. Hampden's opinions, and pronounce upon them; and, therefore, we ought to wait till they legally came before us. It was answered, that as there appeared but small hope of our being permitted to act as an ecclesiastical synod, we had better do what we could; that if we waited till prime ministers voluntarily recommended our assembling, we should be in our graves first; that we did not pronounce any opinion as to whether Dr. Hampden's statements were heretical; we only prayed that an investigation might be made, before his appointment to the office of a bishop.

"The question was put, and as there was some difference of opinion as to the show of hands, the house divided; the yeas going to the prolocutor's left, the noes to the right; the majority were against the motion.

"The last paragraph was to this effect:—'If at any time her Majesty should wish to consult convocation, upon questions relating to the welfare and efficiency of the Church, we would endeavour to deliberate upon them with care and prudence.'

"An archdeacon moved an amendment, which was much to the point, but we can give only an imperfect sketch of it.—'The feeling that convocation should be allowed to consult upon Church affairs was daily increasing. All other religious bodies had their deliberative meetings. We, therefore, earnestly prayed that her Majesty would graciously condescend to grant her licence for us to act.' This was seconded by a proctor, who, in answer to the question,—What were we to deliberate upon? said, about the canons, which had been passed in days of religious intolerance, and therefore were not adapted for times of toleration.

"Another amendment was proposed and seconded, 'praying that no alterations might be made in the rights and privileges of the Church without the consent of convocation.'

"As it was getting late, and we did not like detaining the bishops, and especially our aged president, longer than absolutely necessary, we abstained from discussion, and proceeded to vote on the questions before the house.

"Both amendments were lost by a small majority.

"It was then proposed that the words 'as we earnestly pray,' should be inserted after 'if her Majesty should wish to consult convocation.' This was unanimously agreed to.

"The address then passed the lower house.

"The prolocutor took it to the upper house, and whilst their lordships were considering the amendments, it was proposed by an archdeacon that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury should be asked to appoint some persons to examine the minutes and documents, in order to ascertain what were the privileges, and powers, and mode of proceeding in the lower house, and its relation to the upper house.

"The prolocutor was sent for, and on his return he informed us that

upper house had acceded to the amendment, with the exception of all alteration, which rather increased the force of what we wished. The sentence would run thus—'if her Majesty on any occasion wished to restore the action of convocation, as we earnestly prayed.' Lower house approved the alteration, and the address passed.

An archdeacon observed, that he had intended to have moved to reduce the hypothetical form into a direct prayer, and he wished he could do so.

The prolocutor, who carried the address back to the bishops, informed us that his Grace would see what could be done about consulting the minutes.

The two houses were then prorogued to December 9; and those members who wished to go up with the address, were requested to put down their names.

It was the unanimous feeling of the lower house, that the prolocutor had conducted himself with the greatest courtesy, and impartiality, kindness, throughout the business of the day.

The meeting lasted from half-past eleven to five."

Now, we think, that this Report ought to set at rest any fears that may be entertained as to the proceedings of convocation. A remarkable feature throughout is caution—unwillingness to take a step beyond clearly ascertained rights—respect for the authority of the bishops. This is precisely what might have been expected from the composition of that house at present. Evidently, if there was ever any spirit of insubordination in the lower house, it appears to have been most effectually expelled.

The house is well fitted now to enter on the consideration of such questions, if its powers were defined, and its course of proceeding were marked out.

The necessity of permitting convocation to deliberate is pressed with much earnestness and force in the pamphlet of Mr. Trower. It expresses feelings which are becoming most widely prevalent throughout the Church—feelings of very great dissatisfaction at the exercise of power by the government on subjects of importance to the Church, without the concurrence of the Church herself. It goes further than this; for it expresses feelings of dissatisfaction with one measure, at least, which has been carried with the sanction of the lord primate; and the same feelings are expressed in Mr. Denison's clear and striking pamphlet, and in many other publications. It is evident that the system of government measures does not give satisfaction to the Church. This was remarkably exemplified in the Jerusalem bishopric; and we respectfully submit, that this and similar cases ought to lead to an alteration in the system of communicating with the

Church. If an appeal is made to the Church for co-operation, it ought, we think, to be made in such a way as will give general satisfaction, and inspire general confidence.

We must now select some passages from Mr. Trower's valuable pamphlet as indicative of what is now passing in the mind of, we believe, the great majority of the clergy, and seriously-disposed laity. He grounds his argument for the necessity of reviving convocation on the following five points :—1. The proposed admission of the Jews to Parliament. 2. The proposed appointment of Dr. Hampden. 3. The proceedings of the Committee of Council on Education in reference to trust deeds. 4. The recognition of the Romish hierarchy of Ireland by the lord-lieutenant. 5. The erection of Romish sees in England. On these subjects, Mr. Trower writes as follows :—

“ Has your Lordship considered, that the effect of such measures as these must be to raise in the minds of the most thoughtful and moderate persons, very serious questions as to the continuance of that connexion between the Church and the State, under which this country has so long flourished ; but which has harmonized only with a state of law and a course of policy altogether at variance with the principles which are embodied in the above-mentioned series of measures ?” • • •

“ The first is the proposed admission of Jews to Parliament. From the day on which that measure may be adopted, the character of England as a Christian nation, governed by a Christian Legislature, and bearing on her front the cross of Christ as her hope and glory, will be among things that have passed away, and blessings which have been neglected and lost. Nearly twenty years have now passed since the first step in the downward road was taken ; and we ceased as a nation, and by the profession required of the members of our Legislature, to protest against Romish error, and to uphold the simplicity of the truth.” • • •

“ It seems to me impossible, that, while the voice of her own synod is silenced, and measures affecting the religious and spiritual welfare of her members can only emanate from Parliament, the Church can possibly acquiesce in a state of things which allows a Jew or other professed unbeliever to have a voice in Christian legislation.

“ The next act of government which I mentioned, is the proposed elevation of Dr. Hampden to the Episcopate.” • • •

“ Surely, a more tyrannical abuse of the power which they found in their hands was never committed by any advisers of the Crown, than in thus selecting the divine probably the most unwelcome to the Church in the whole kingdom, the only one, so far as I know, under the censure of either of the Universities on the ground of his theological opinions, and thrusting him upon an unhappy diocese, in reliance on the notorious difficulty, in the present relation between Church and State, of offering any effectual resistance to an appointment of this kind, however objectionable. Whether it will be possible to resist

ally in the present instance, remains to be proved; but the point which I wish to call your Lordship's attention is this:—How indissoluble it becomes that the powers of Convocation should be in exercise, if the minister of the day so abuses the power in his hands to select for the spiritual rule of the Church the only person who has incurred the formal censure of one of the ancient Universities of the Kingdom on the score of heterodox opinions." \* \* \*

For the purposes of the present letter, it is sufficient for me to say, that by an arbitrary assumption of power the Committee of Council on Education are at this moment imposing, as a condition of Government aid, on the builders of Church schools, the insertion, in the deeds of such schools, of certain management-clauses, which seem objectionable in themselves, and have such an appearance of implying a breach of faith with the Church, that remonstrances are emanating from the several diocesan boards, and a feeling of deepest distrust is taking the place of that disposition to confide in the intentions of Government which has prevailed during the few last years.

Whether the suspicion be well-founded or not, no one can deny that the history of these management-clauses awakens the gravest suspicion of an intention, on the part of the Committee of Council, to employ some one who has influence with that body, to pave the way for a combined system of education, against which it is admitted that the public convictions and sympathies of England revolt." \* \* \*

The Act of Parliament commonly called the Roman Catholic Relief Act, provides, in one of its sections, that no person shall assume the style or title of any existing Bishopric, Archbishopric, or ecclesiastical office: and for every transgression of this enactment the offending party is liable to a penalty of one hundred pounds. It is notorious that the Roman Catholic prelates in Ireland openly and defiantly set at nought this provision. They treat it as a dead letter; a obsolete or unmeaning enactment, which was never meant to be enforced, and which no one would dream of enforcing. And what is the conduct of the Queen's representative in Ireland, the sworn executor of the law, acknowledging by the title of honour, which rightfully belongs to the Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, persons who are openly and notoriously violating the law in this very manner? What, but to countenance the violation of the law, which he is sworn to execute? \* \* \*

It is plain that this applies with equal or greater force to the measure which I mentioned last, and which there is too much reason to think has received the sanction of Government,—the erection of Roman Catholic Bishoprics and Archbishoprics in English towns and cities. It is little whether these intrusive prelates assume the titles of existing Bishoprics; or whether they derive their title from places such as Birmingham or Westminster, in which, from their importance and population, it may be hoped that Bishoprics of the Church of England may be established. In the one case, indeed, the act of such intrusive prelates is more openly illegal, and also their intrusion more



shameless and insulting. But I know not whether the danger of the spread of erroneous doctrine is not greater, if in places which are not as yet sees of Bishops, the ground is thus preoccupied by Roman Catholic prelates; to whom, it is plain, the usual titles of English Archbishops or Bishops will be conceded; and who, by the use they so well know how to make of any such concession, and by all the pomp of an attractive ceremonial, will have the most fearful opportunities of gaining influence and propagating error. Every one who has reflected on the condition of Ireland, must see what influence has been gained by the Romish priesthood, and what incalculable mischief has been done, by their assumption of titles which imply that the persons assuming them are Bishops in the same sense in which the prelates of the Established Church are Bishops of their respective sees; and have a spiritual rule similar to the jurisdiction which belongs to the lawful Bishops in their several dioceses."

All this is sound and excellent in itself. We would only say to such as Mr. Trower, "Do not let your zeal evaporate in words; but take measures for pressing the claims of the Church on the legislature, and on your bishops. Do it temperately, unitedly, and *perseveringly*, and you will undoubtedly prevail." The Church ought to direct her attention to the legislature especially: nothing will be accomplished unless an impression be made there. If the voice of the Church is heard within the walls of parliament in numerous and well-signed petitions, she will soon find plenty of advocates there. If she does not gain any number of bishops she wishes, and if convocation is not revived, it will be simply because the Church has not taken the right course of action. It is not by complaints, or pamphlets alone, that good will be done. Men must *act*,—and act at once, and perseveringly, year after year, on parliament.

Mr. Denison, whose able pamphlet we have above referred to, presses one of the considerations to which Mr. Trower refers, namely, the conduct of government in reference to education. He points out the danger which exists in the present system of legislation, which places it in the power of the Committee of Council to produce "Minutes" at any moment, which may be of the most pernicious character. We feel that this is a point which should be narrowly watched and protested against by all churchmen. There is an arbitrary and irresponsible system at work, which is under the guidance of persons suspected by the Church. Now, here is an illustration of the evils resulting from the want of a frank and open conference with the Church generally in convocation. The sanction of the lord-primate to the forms of trust deeds proposed by the government has not been deemed sufficient. The Church herself, it is thought, ought to have

been consulted. We commend to especial attention the remarks of Mr. Denison on this all-important subject ; and we have no doubt that his pamphlet, and that of the Rev. Henry Wilberforce, will command that general approbation and concurrence which they fairly and fully merit.

The government appears to have been forgetful of its intention of conciliating the Church, when it permitted powers like those of the Committee of Council to exist. We trust that it will retrace its steps. Mr. Denison recommends all churchmen "to pause and to stay their hand" for a few months, before they connect their schools with government.

We must now speak a few words on the pamphlet by ECCLESIASTES, on "Church Emancipation and Church Reform." This series of letters, which made its appearance, originally, in the pages of the "Morning Herald," is very well adapted for its purpose—that of interesting the middle classes in the cause of the Church, with a view to the restoration of her legislative powers, and the increase of her episcopate. It is a clever, and popularly-written pamphlet ; and will, we hope, find its way into extensive circulation. We have, here, just the same set of principles and views, which we have already referred to. After alluding to the growth of the spirit of mammon, in the nature and the way in which it influences the State, the writer proceeds thus :—

"The worst part of the whole business, however, is the way in which this system of national government acts upon the Church. In the good old times, when the nation had a national faith—when the Church was the nation's Church, because she taught and maintained the nation's faith—when Church principles were the principles for which the nation looked in those who were to be its rulers,—the Church allowed some of her most important powers to be exercised or controlled by the Sovereign, and by those whom the Sovereign chose, from time to time, for carrying on the business of government.

"The most important of those powers which the Church thus surrendered to the State, while the State was of one mind with her, are, the power of deliberating on her own affairs, and legislating for herself touching matters which concern her own welfare and efficiency, in a representative assembly of her own members ; and the power of appointing those who shall bear rule in her, as the executive government of the Church. Properly speaking, these powers were never given up by the Church into the hands of the State, but into the hands of the Sovereign, who is the Head of the State, and in whom the Church recognizes God's minister and God's ordinance. At no time did the Church give up these powers into the hands of the ministers of the Crown, much less into the hands of parliament ; as long as the laws, which the Church made for the government of her own members, did not touch any matter that belonged to the cognizance of parliament, parliament had

no right to interfere; the Sovereign's consent to the laws agreed upon by the Church in her own representative assembly, was all that was required to make them valid and binding upon her members. Still, while cabinets and parliaments consisted of churchmen, and acted on Church principles, churchmen did not jealously watch over the privileges which belonged to them, not as citizens, but as churchmen. Parliament was suffered to legislate for the Church in matters about which the Church alone can properly legislate for herself; and cabinet ministers were allowed, in the appointment of bishops and in other things, to exercise that supremacy which, by the constitution of the Church, and the law of the land, belongs to the person of the Sovereign alone.

"But what was a trifling encroachment and a slight inconvenience, while the government and the legislation of the country at large, proceeded upon Church principles, has become an enormous evil and a monstrous injustice, since Church principles have been thrown overboard by cabinets and parliaments, and the interests of property have become the chief consideration by which they are guided. For thereby it has actually come to pass, that what the Church surrendered to the Sovereign as to God's ordinance, has been seized upon by parliaments and ministries, which are the ordinance of mammon; and mammon has thus become possessed of the chief power and patronage over the Church of God."

The author gives a clear and satisfactory statement of the constitution of the Church, and having pointed out the extreme injustice of preventing the Church from meeting in convocation for the management of her own affairs, urges the importance of petitioning parliament and the bishops for the revival of convocation, and states his conviction of her ultimate success in such an appeal. He then proceeds to show the total inadequacy of the present number of bishops, and the great evils of all sorts and kinds which arise from it. We have seldom seen these points put so forcibly as here. But we hasten to the author's suggestions, in reference to the increase of the episcopate, in connexion with the revival of convocation.

"There are three main causes which operate against the episcopate under the present system; namely, the mode of appointment, the extent of the charge, and the disparity of worldly rank and position between the bishop and his clergy. All these causes could be removed at one stroke, if the Church were permitted—what assuredly no temporal power can have a right to prevent her from doing—to create a sufficient episcopate for her internal government. In order to make the episcopate sufficient, that is, to enable the bishops to be in deed what they are in name, the spiritual fathers of their diocesan flocks, the spiritual rulers, and not rulers only, but counsellors and friends, of the parochial clergy, the number of bishops throughout England and Wales ought to be about

200, certainly not less than 150. Now there is no reason whatever, why such an episcopate, of sufficient strength to meet the exigencies of the case, should not be created by a national Church council; a reference to the system of the Church in the primitive ages,—yea, a reference to the plans which were actually in contemplation at the beginning of the reformation of our Church, would remove all doubt as to the lawfulness of giving to the episcopal order that degree of extension, in proportion to the population and the numbers of the clergy; on the contrary, it would at once demonstrate that such extension is absolutely necessary, in order to make the episcopate what it originally was, and was intended to be. With regard to the necessary funds, no difficulty could arise. There are in the existing endowments of the Church ample resources for providing the moderate maintenance which bishops, not encumbered with baronial rank, nor overburdened with extensive dioceses, would require; and even if there should be some deficiency, that would cheerfully be made up by opulent churchmen, if they once saw the Church in a fair way of being made thoroughly efficient.

“These moderately endowed bishoprics would not be objects of worldly ambition, like the baronial stations of the present episcopate; nor would the Crown have the same claim to nominate to them as to the existing sees, to which the Crown nominates in consideration of the political rank, and the feudal tenures and other endowments in the gift of the Crown, which are attached to them. The Church might, therefore, according to primitive usage, be permitted, *bonâ fide*, to choose her own bishops, giving the Crown a veto. The bishops so chosen would have the affections of those who chose them; they would be distinguished from their brethren in the ministry only by the higher order of spiritual ministration committed to their hands; they would be able to associate with them constantly, intimately; and to rule over them and over their flocks by brotherly love, not through fear and worldly regard.

“Out of such an episcopate, chosen by the Church, sufficiently numerous for the official discharge of its functions, and essentially spiritual in its character, the Crown, acting by the sign manual of the Sovereign, or by the advice and concurrence of privy-councillors, being themselves members of the Church, might, without the slightest inconvenience, be left free to fill up vacancies on the parliamentary bench of bishops: for the rank and revenues attached to that station could not, in such a case, either mar the efficiency, or injure the character, of the episcopate.”

Of the general notion here expressed we most cordially approve; and we beg to tender our thanks to the author for his manly and powerful pamphlet. At the conclusion he makes some good remarks on recent appointments to bishoprics.

**ART. IV.—1. Minutes of several Conversations between the Methodist Ministers in the connexion established by the late Rev. JOHN WESLEY, A.M., at their one hundred and fourth Annual Conference, begun in Liverpool, on Wednesday, July 28, 1847. London, 1847.**

**2. Narrative of the Proceedings and Resolutions of the United Wesleyan Committee of Privileges and Education, in reference to the recent Minutes of the Committee of Privy Council on Education; with the Correspondence between the United Committee and the Committee of Council on Education, in March and April, 1847. London, 1847.**

**3. A Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism; with Notes and an Appendix. By EDMUND GRINDROD. London, 1842.**

“THERE is no new thing under the sun,” is an old saying which new examples are constantly proving true. For a time, indeed, and in its first beginnings, a thing may appear new; but let it unfold itself, and work out its principles with sufficient distinctness to mark its character, and it will be found that “it hath been already of old time.” So it is, among others, with regard to Wesleyan Methodism. To see a system which rose under the specious pretext of an improvement upon the existing state of the Church, settle down into a separatism immeasurably inferior to the Church; to see a schism which had its origin in direct insubordination to Church order and Church government, develop a hierarchical organization, and put forth hierarchical pretensions infinitely more stringent and despotic than the most *ultra*-Churchman ever aimed at, is a thing which has happened before, and will happen again: and precisely for this reason it is instructive to trace the course by which any given system has accomplished that natural round of transformations. As in medical science the dissection of bodies affected with particular diseases is not the least useful among the means of attaining to a correct knowledge of the functions of the different organs, so the anatomy of schism is no contemptible help towards the right understanding and the due appreciation of Church principles. Partly for this reason, and partly on account of the extraordinary

pretensions which are advanced, and the Jesuitical part which is at this time being enacted towards the Church, by what, eight years ago, still went by the modest name of "the united societies of the people called Methodists," but now dignifies itself by the appellation of "the British Wesleyan Church," we have made up our minds to lay the body so described on the dissecting-table, and to invite our readers to a short lecture on its pathology.

It is an argument often used, and a very powerful argument, against the present constitution and attitude of the Wesleyan body, that they involve a flagrant violation of the views and principles of its founder. Indeed, so clear is the evidence on this point, that all the sophistry which abounds in the armoury of "the connexion" is insufficient to make any thing like a tolerable defence against it. We need go no further than the famous passage in Wesley's sermon on the ministerial office:—

"In 1744, all the Methodist preachers had their first conference; but none of them dreamed that the being called to preach gave them any right to administer sacraments; and when that question was proposed, 'In what light are we to consider ourselves?' it was answered, '*As extraordinary messengers, raised up to provoke the ordinary ones to jealousy.*' In order hereto, one of our first rules was, given to each preacher: 'You are to do *that part* of the work which we appoint.' But *what work* was this? Did we ever appoint you to administer sacraments? to exercise the priestly office? Such a design never entered into our mind; it was the furthest from our thoughts; and if any preacher had taken such a step, we should have looked upon it as a palpable breach of this rule, and consequently as *a recantation of our connexion.* . . . .

"I wish all you who are vulgarly termed Methodists, would seriously consider what has been said; and particularly you whom God has commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no means follow from hence, that you are commissioned to baptize, or to administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamed of this for ten or twenty years after ye began to preach; ye did not then, *like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, 'seek the priesthood also;'* ye knew, 'No man taketh this honour unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.' Oh, contain yourselves within your own bounds."—*John Wesley's Works, third edition, with the last corrections of the Author.* Lond. 1829. vol. vii. pp. 277. 279, 280.

Let not the reader suppose that this passage is taken from some of the earlier effusions of the "venerable founder of the connexion," written at that unripe age when the "heyday" of theology is not yet tamed down in the soul, and when, under the

influence of "the vehement prejudice of his education," John Wesley, the son of a pious and orthodox clergyman, was in some measure given to what, in the "*Wesleyan Tracts for the Times*," is facetiously represented as Puseyism, "nearly a hundred years before" the time of Dr. Pusey. Far from it. The date of the sermon, from which the above is an extract, is May 4, 1789; it was published in the *Arminian Magazine*, in the year 1790: John Wesley had therefore, at the time when he addressed this pointed remonstrance to the preachers of the connexion, reached his eighty-sixth year; a period of life at which, if at all, a man may be supposed to have arrived at his sober judgment; and after which Wesley had little time left to think of any other change than that great and final change which overtook him on the 2nd of March, 1791. It is no hyperbole, therefore, to say, that, with one foot in his grave, John Wesley solemnly warned his preachers against the presumption of "seeking the priesthood;" a presumption which he denounced, without circumlocution, as the sin of "Korah, Dathan, and Abiram."

But it would be extremely unjust, both to the founder and to the "connexion," to suppress the triumphant argument by which the inferences apparently deducible from the foregoing extract are refuted in the admirable tract entitled "*Why don't you come to Church?*"—the first of a series, published under the title "*Wesleyan Tracts for the Times*," in a volume, the meagreness of which, both in bulk and thought, bears to the dimensions of the original "*Tracts for the Times*," about the same proportion as an itinerant "of the true breed," reduced to extreme leanness by the internal corrosion of an acid temper, bears to a portly prebendary of the olden time. In the aforesaid tract, then, we are informed that John Wesley "did not always hold these sentiments;" that he "avows very different and even opposite opinions in other parts of his writings:" and, lest any of the gainsayers of Wesleyanism should thence draw conclusions unfavourable to John Wesley's consistency, the author of the tract guards his fair fame by the following apologetic remarks:—

"He only changed his opinions upon better information, as every other man may do, and has a right to do. If his conduct at any given time was at variance with the opinions which he *then* held, he certainly was inconsistent; but not otherwise. It is an easy thing to select detached passages from the fourteen large volumes of his works, which were published at intervals during the space of half a century, and, by comparing them together, to make a show of contradiction. This, you know, sir, is the trick which infidels attempt to practise with the sacred volume. But the same rule by which we confute them



will hold good in its application to Mr. Wesley's works. 'Observe the several times of writing, and the seeming inconsistency is at an end.'"  
—*Wesleyan Tracts for the Times*, No. I. pp. 6, 7.

Having thus laid down his canon for distinguishing consistency from inconsistency, the author of the tract clinches his argument by a specimen of certain "letters of orders," which it appears John Wesley was in the practice of issuing, and of which we will not defraud the curiosity of our readers.

"Know all men, by these presents, that I, John Wesley, late Fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, did, on the day of the date hereof, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers,) set apart Henry Moore for the office of a presbyter in the Church of God; a man whom I judge qualified to feed the flock of Christ, and to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the Church of England; and, as such, I do hereby recommend him to all whom it may concern. In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal. JOHN WESLEY."—*Wesleyan Tracts for the Times*, No. I. p. 9.

The production of these "letters of orders" demolishes the denunciation of the sin of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, before quoted, to a much greater extent than even the acute author of "Why don't you come to Church?" seems to be aware. For, if it is admissible, as in common with John Wesley we think it is, to apply the example of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram to an unauthorized handling of sacred things under the Christian dispensation, it is pretty evident that while Henry Moore, who, not content with his situation as a preacher, aspired yet further to the administration of the sacraments, stands in the shoes of Dathan and Abiram, who were sons of Reuben, of the laity of Israel,—the part of Korah, who, being a son of Levi, a minister of the sanctuary, aspired to the highest office, that of the priesthood, was, in the transaction just recorded, enacted by John Wesley himself and his assistants, the "other ordained ministers," who, having been lawfully appointed to an inferior office in the Church of God, presumptuously took in hand the exercise of the highest office of the ministry—that of the episcopate. Upon these grounds, we concur with the author of the tract in the conclusion, that the issuing of such "letters of orders" as those which we have transcribed, is the flattest contradiction that

<sup>1</sup> The authenticity of these "letters of orders" is called in question, we know not upon what ground, by the author of "*Modern Methodism*:" London, Burns, 1842. But even if this objection could be sustained, it would not alter the main argument; the ordination of Dr. Coke as "bishop" for America, and of several preachers for Scotland, being undoubted matters of fact.

could possibly be given to the sentiment previously quoted from John Wesley's sermon. In accordance with the canon laid down, therefore, we postulate, for the sake of "the venerable founder's" consistency, that the two documents placed in such close juxta-position in our argument, shall historically be divided by a space of time bearing some proportion to the gulf that yawns between the two systems which they respectively represent. And, forasmuch as the system of which the issuing of "letters of orders" is the exponent, which constitutes the Methodist preachers stewards of the sacramental mysteries of the Christian Church, is that which ultimately prevailed in the "connexion," and continues in it to this day, we take it for granted that the "letters of orders" are of a date subsequent to the sermon from which we have given an extract.

To the utter confusion of all *à priori* reasoning, however, it turns out, on referring to dates, that the "letters of orders" bear date of February 27th, 1789; *i. e.* nine weeks and a half distant from the sermon, and that not subsequent to it, but taking precedence of it in point of time. What shall we say, then? that John Wesley was inconsistent? that the acts which he solemnly performed and authorized in the latter part of February, were as solemnly anathematized by him in the early part of May of the self-same year? Here the clergyman who figures away in "Why don't you come to Church?" and who has already been nonplust to such a degree as to make him exclaim, "Was it so really? I had no idea of this;"—is brought to a complete stand. But although the poor man is evidently below the usual average of Church brains, still all the logic that the Church wots of is, we candidly confess it, unable to cope with such a contradiction as that, or to avoid, by any possible construction to be put upon it, the ugly imputation of inconsistency upon John Wesley. But what to the churchman presents an insurmountable difficulty, is as plain to the Wesleyan as the great level of Shinar; and accordingly he proceeds thereon to erect the tower of strength that shall make a name for John Wesley as a consistent man. Not to weary our readers, or waste our paper, with a full-length transcript, we shall content ourselves with stating that the foundation-stone on which the edifice of John Wesley's consistency is made to rest, is the ingenious distinction between "principles" and "plans," which, says the tract, "are very distinct things." The upshot of the matter is, that while John Wesley held fast by the "*principle*" of "Aaron's rod that budded," his "*plan*" was to adopt the line of proceeding of "Korah, Dathan, and Abiram." In further elucidation of the

way in which this distinction between "principles" and "plans" worked, the tract thus continues:—

"He began upon the plan of seeking the help of the clergy only; but, where he could not find clergymen to assist him, his principle drove him to accept the help of laymen. His 'vehement prejudice of education' rendered both these arrangements [lay-helpers, and preaching in unconsecrated places] most unpleasant to him; but his sense of duty, his fixed adherence to principle, enabled him to surmount the unpleasantness. So, upon the same principle, when some of the societies would otherwise have been deprived of the sacraments, he authorized a few of his preachers to administer them. But he never deviated unnecessarily from the order of the Established Church; and hence arose his seeming inconsistency in this matter. He appointed some preachers to administer the sacraments, where he found it absolutely necessary to do so; but he positively forbade those whom he had not appointed to undertake the work. And this is the real drift of the sermon from which you quote. It is an absolute prohibition of the administration of the sacraments by the unordained preachers; and is so far a striking testimony to the manner in which he strove to soften that separation from the establishment which he saw could not be wholly avoided. This view of the case is strengthened, when we read, as we do in Myles's 'History,' (8vo, 1813, p. 175,) that when he ordained these preachers to administer in England, he 'strongly advised them that, according to his example, they should continue united to the Established Church, so far as the blessed work, in which they were engaged, would permit.' So, whether I look at the small number of persons to whom he gave this power, or at the advice which he gave them as to the exercise of it, or at the large number of those to whom he refused it, I see plain proof of his consistency throughout. Such was his love for the Established Church, that he would not depart from it further than was absolutely necessary. But so strong and fixed was his determination to 'seek first the kingdom of God,' so closely did he adhere to the *principle* of promoting vital, practical religion, at all costs and hazards,—that he was willing for its sake to sacrifice the dearest object of his affections, the Established Church itself."—*Wesleyan Tracts for the Times*, No. I. pp. 10, 11.

Here we have it as plain as words can make it. John Wesley, a man to whom not only a single parish, but a whole university, yea, and an entire colony, appeared too narrow for the display of his energies, who, like the Bishop of Rome, "looked upon all the world as his parish;" this man has one object which he pursues "at all costs and hazards:" he inscribes on his banner, "*ad maiorem Dei gloriam*," as the Methodists of popery express it; and having done so, all things become lawful to him. He has an opinion, made probable by the consent of many doctors, that to

take in hand shall be taken. ~~hence~~ ministrations without having received due responsibility for so doing, is neither more nor less than the sin of ~~led~~ <sup>led</sup> ~~the~~, Dathan, and Abiram:" but then he takes another "probable opinion," that such unauthorized ministrations may conduce "*ad majorem Dei gloriam*;" and therefore in the true spirit of Jesuit morality he "follows, of two contradictory probable opinions in *practice*, that which he prefers, although may appear to him less probable in *theory*." A captious person might ask, what right John Wesley had to lay "an absolute prohibition of the administration of the sacraments" upon "ordained preachers;" what right he, a man neither consecrated nor otherwise appointed to the episcopate, had to ordain preachers, or to authorize them to administer the sacrament. But this is a common-place cavil, applicable indeed to ordinary men, but wholly inapplicable to "venerable founders" and "fathers," be their name John or Ignatius, Loyola or Wesley.

But although it is impossible to clear the memory of John Wesley of gross inconsistency, and that in so serious a matter the presumptuous handling of holy things, contrary to his expressly recorded conviction, it is but fair to state, that from the general tone of his writings, and from the avowed intention though unhappily not the practical tendency, of his measures, appears that he was to the last moment of his life utterly opposed to the idea of becoming, what he has become in spite of himself, the founder of a separatist body. His case is a striking illustration of the dangerous, as well as sinful, character of the Jesuit principle upon which he acted in this matter—the principle doing evil, that good may come. For the sake of the good which he conceived, would be effected by ordaining some of his preachers he was prevailed upon to do what he himself distinctly acknowledged to be unlawful,—he assumed ministerial functions which he was not authorized to perform. And this he did at a time when he was fully aware of the tendency to separation from the Church, which had gained extensive ground among his followers as the natural consequence of his irregular proceedings; at a time when he felt it necessary to publish, in addition to the "Reasons" which he had published thirty years before, "Further Thoughts against a Separation from the Church of England." In the document, which was put forth in December, 1789, only fifteen months before his death, and which has therefore an almost contemporary character, he says:—

"I never had any design of separating from the Church; I have such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general desire it, when I am no more seen. I do, and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all I can

many of them will separate, formed a crisis in which I am apt to think, not one-half, perhaps not a third, of them. *Thus to the p. so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party, which con<sup>d</sup> pres<sup>ly</sup> will dwindle into a dry, dull, separate party.* In flat opposition<sup>n</sup> these, I declare once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that *none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it.*" — *Further Thoughts on Separation from the Church.* John Wesley's Works, vol. xiii. pp. 240, 241.

These protestations were, no doubt, sincere<sup>2</sup>; but they were of no avail. John Wesley himself had, by his inconsistent and Jesuitical conduct, invalidated them beforehand. It happened to him, as it ever will and must happen to men whom their own superiority, or the force of circumstances, has placed in the position of leaders, if they venture to conduct their followers to the edge of a precipice, in the vain confidence that the power of their personal influence will be sufficient to restrain them from taking the fatal

<sup>2</sup> It is but right to mention at the same time, that when it suits the purpose of any of the connexion to represent John Wesley as having been a rank dissenter, they are by no means deficient in titbits of evidence to support their case. A curious paper on this subject, headed "John Wesley and the Church," is contained in "*Stephens's Methodist Magazine*," for August, 1834. Among the proofs which the writer adduces in support of his assertions, is an extract from a letter of John Wesley to a clergyman who appears to have been expostulating with him on his irregularities, dated August 19, 1785, to the following effect: "For these forty years I have been in doubt concerning that question, 'What obedience is due to the *heathenish priests and mitred infidels*?' I have from time to time proposed my doubts to the most pious and sensible clergymen I knew: but they gave me no satisfaction; rather, they seemed to be puzzled as well as me. Some obedience I always paid to the bishops, in obedience to the laws of the land. But I cannot see, that I am under any obligation to obey them further than these laws require. It is in obedience to these laws, that I never exercised in England the powers which I believe God has given me. I firmly believe, I am a scriptural *ἐπίσκοπος*, as much as any man in England or in Europe. For the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove . . . .

"I submit still (though sometimes with a doubting conscience) to *mitred infidels*. I do indeed vary from them in some points of doctrine, and in some points of discipline; by preaching abroad, for instance, by praying extempore, and by forming societies, but not a hair's-breadth further than I believe to be meet, right, and my bounden duty."—*John Wesley's Works*, vol. xiii. pp. 220, 221; quoted in *Stephens's Methodist Magazine*, vol. i. p. 83.

It is a painful reflection that John Wesley should ever have been betrayed into such language as this; but still more painful it is, that he should have been betrayed into it upon a provocation, not *received*, but *given* by himself; his assumption, namely, of the episcopal office in ordaining preachers for Scotland and America. Only a few months before, he had received the most courteous treatment, as appears from his own Journal, at the hands of the cathedral clergy in Ireland, who received his people by hundreds at the Holy Communion, invited him to assist them in its administration, and offered him private hospitality. And how great his respect for the mitre was, may be inferred from the fact, that when, on one occasion, one of the "*mitred infidels*" made him a low bow in the street, he thought the occurrence sufficiently important to be recorded in his Journal! See John Wesley's Journal under the date of August 20, 1784.

leap :—the leap will be taken, however much they may deprecate it ; and the responsibility of the leap assuredly rests no less with those who have led their weaker brethren into a perilous position in which they grow dizzy, than with those who cast themselves down headlong when their brain is reeling.

This we take to be the true view of the question, which has of late been so much debated between Churchmen and Wesleyans ; the question, namely, whether or not the Wesleyans are entitled to appeal to the authority of him whose name they bear, in defence of the position which they have assumed since his death. That John Wesley would have given his sanction to the measures by which this position was brought about, as the Wesleyans maintain, we do not believe ; but neither do we believe the argument which charges the Wesleyans with placing themselves in direct contradiction with John Wesley, to be a sound and tenable one. When men depart from the right and lawful course, especially in dealing with the ordinance of God, they lose the power of controlling the tendency of their own actions. John Wesley lost that power,—a circumstance which involves the condemnation, *ipso facto*, of the course pursued by him ; and therefore he is, not intentionally, it is true, but substantially, the author of the schism which bears his name. What the enthusiasm (many passages of his Journal, things kept out of sight and notice by his soberer followers, would justify us in using the stronger term, fanaticism) of John Wesley began, was matured and perfected by an unenthusiastic successor, a man not less remarkable in his way than Wesley himself, though of essentially different mind and character. As in other instances, so in this, the spirit of cold calculation and worldly wisdom pruned down the rampant sapling of enthusiasm, and trained it into a regular shape. Methodism, like Jesuitism, has had its two eminent generals ; one to originate, the other to consolidate. Never would the Institute founded by Loyola have become what it is, but for General Claudius Aquaviva, nor the connexion set on foot by John Wesley, but for President Jabez Bunting.

What struggles took place after the reins of the connexion had dropped from the hands of its inconsistent “apostle” John, at his death, until they came to be firmly grasped by those of his consistent successor Jabez, it were long and wearisome to tell ; and our readers will probably feel obliged to us for remembering that the office which we undertook, was not that of historiographer, but that of prosecutor. In how critical a position the “united societies” were placed for a time, may be gathered even from the faint and delicate allusions to that period in Jackson’s Centenary.



“ The death of its founder formed a crisis in Wesleyan Methodism. While he lived, he was a bond of union both to the preachers and to all the societies ; but whether their unity could be preserved when his personal influence was no longer felt, was a question of very difficult solution, concerning which there were great searchings of heart in many quarters. If the ‘ Deed of Declaration ’ could be acted upon, so that the governing power, which that instrument created, should be generally acknowledged, there could be no just ground of painful apprehension ; but if these objects could not be gained, the breaking up of the connexion was inevitable.”—*The Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism, by Thomas Jackson, President of the Conference*, pp. 224, 225.

The “ Deed of Declaration ” here referred to is the deed executed by John Wesley in the year 1784, by which he appointed for the supreme government of the connexion after his death one hundred preachers, named by him, who should constitute the “ conference,” with power to fill up vacancies in their own body from time to time. To this assembly, despotic in its origin and irresponsible in its character, the whole connexion is in legal bondage ; for to them it belongs to appoint from year to year the preachers who shall officiate in the different Methodist chapels ; and, as one of the conditions of the trust under which those chapels are held by the local trustees, is, that the preachers so appointed shall have the free use and benefit of them for the purposes of public worship, the right of the conference over these chapels may at any time be enforced in a court of law, as was done successfully in the famous Chancery suit instituted against the ecclesiastical authorities of the connexion by Dr. Warren in the year 1835.

“ The first attempt,” Mr. Jackson continues, “ to set aside the ‘ Deed of Declaration,’ and, by necessary consequence, to subvert the itinerant ministry which Mr. Wesley had instituted, was made by a body of trustees of chapels, who claimed the right of appointing the preachers to their respective pulpits. This scheme was resisted, and came to nought. Had it succeeded, the Methodist societies would at once have been converted into independent churches ; the regular exchange of preachers would necessarily have ceased ; and the plans of Mr. Wesley would have been only matters of history.

“ The next attempt was made by certain persons, of democratic principles, but of very limited views, who contended for the introduction into the conference, as members of that body, of men whom the ‘ Deed of Declaration ’ never contemplated. This plan was also resisted, as being directly ruinous in its tendency. Had it been adopted, the conference, as constituted by Mr. Wesley, would have had no existence ; and no other body could have legally performed its prescribed functions. Another body could have had no just authority either to appoint



the preachers to the chapels, or to execute the discipline of the connexion. The conference was nothing but as it was defined, and invested with power, by the 'Deed of Declaration;' and, therefore, the moment that deed was superseded, there would have been an end of the Wesleyan itinerancy and order. Another system might have been devised, but Wesleyan Methodism, in its essential principles, would have been no more. The body of the preachers and people in that eventful age remained nobly steadfast in their adherence to the true Wesleyan principles; and, under God, the 'Deed of Declaration' was their sheet-anchor in every storm. It has been of equal advantage in more modern times; and its utility and benefits will probably be as lasting as the world, according to the design of its author."—*Jackson's Centenary*, pp. 225—227.

From this description of President Jackson, which is fully borne out by the deed itself, and by the proceedings of the conference, it appears that this "Deed of Declaration" is, in fact, the great charter of Methodism. The power given by it, both over the places of worship and over the officiating ministers, is absolute: the former are held upon trust, subject to the conference; the latter are dependent, not only for their ministerial character, but for their sphere of action from year to year, upon the bidding of the same conference. And this all-powerful body is self-elected. The majority may at any time cashier any member of the conference, or depose and excommunicate any minister "for any cause which to the conference might seem fit and necessary;" vacancies are filled up by the election of the remaining number of the legal hundred; and although the custom is, to fill up three out of every four vacancies in order of seniority, and to allow the preachers who have travelled fourteen years and upwards, to nominate one of their own number to the fourth vacancy, yet these modifications of the despotic principle of self-election are not in the deed, nor can they be introduced into it. They are concessions made by the conference, which may at any time be suspended or revoked; and upon any occasion on which the conference may see fit to assert the plenitude of its powers, according to "the bond," the connexion at large has no alternative but submission to the conference, or annihilation of Wesleyan Methodism<sup>3</sup>. The only check upon this absolute despotism of the conference is the power of the people to absent themselves from the chapels, and to withhold the supplies. But even this check is nugatory, as long as the people have any value or affection left for the principles and the associations of the connexion; for upon

<sup>3</sup> The "Deed of Declaration" is recited in Appendix I. of *Grindrod's Compendium*; and the same work contains in part i. ch. i. s. 1, an account of "the composition of the conference."

the slightest symptom of insubordination, the conference has it in its power to say, "Very well; in that case we shall withdraw our minister, and shut up your chapel; you shall either do as we bid you, or you shall cease to be Methodists." It must be an extreme case, therefore, that shall induce any effectual resistance to be made to the will of the conference in any given locality: the idea of such resistance in the body at large is almost inconceivable; especially as communications of any kind between malcontents in different localities are prohibited under the severest penalties. Nothing can be more characteristic of despotism, except it were the "composition" and the irresponsible power of the conference itself, than the limitations by which even the exercise of the right of "memorializing" the conference, the only right left to the members of the connexion, is circumscribed. This feature of the Methodist constitution is too remarkable, not to be made known in its details. The only opportunity of expressing any wish for alteration of any kind, occurs once in every year, when the safety-valve of the system is opened, or rather the offer of opening it made, for one moment.

"After the final close of the June quarterly meeting [of each circuit] every year, the superintendent [who is the nominee of the conference] shall detain the circuit stewards, and all the society stewards . . . and shall ascertain from them, whether there really exists, in *that circuit*, a general or considerable dissatisfaction with any of our existing rules, or a prevalent and earnest desire for the enactment of any new and additional regulations. If it be the opinion of a majority of the persons so consulted, or even of any considerable proportion of them, that the wish for alteration is *strong and extensive*, and, moreover, that the matter is *clearly of such importance* as to justify the calling of a special circuit meeting, in order to consider the propriety of sending a memorial to the conference on the subject, then, and in every such case, the superintendent is hereby *directed and required* to summon . . . such special circuit meeting."—*Grindrod's Compendium*, 162.

Under these regulations, the character of which is, in a great measure, discretionary, and the discretion vested in the nominee and representative of the conference, a "special circuit meeting" is not likely to be a matter of frequent occurrence; but, supposing the existence of a desire for reform sufficiently strong to bring out this meeting, let us see what its powers are:—

"At such meeting, any member thereof *may propose for consideration* . . . the propriety of *memorializing the conference* respecting the repeal or alteration of any of our existing laws, or of the enactment of any additional rules. Such memorial, *if approved by a majority* of the

persons present, shall be signed *forthwith* by the individuals who concur in its adoption, and *then immediately* placed in the hands of the superintendent, who is made responsible for its delivery . . . to the president of the conference . . . And all such memorials shall be received by the conference, and referred to a committee of its members, who shall carefully examine, consider, and classify the whole, and report their opinion thereupon to the conference."—*Grindrod's Compendium*, p. 164.

A minority, therefore, has not even the right of memorializing: all that wish for a change must be individually handed up to the conference by name; no time or opportunity is given for collecting signatures, even to a mere petition; and of that petition the conference at last disposes at its pleasure, upon the opinion of a committee composed of members of its own. The right of petition, so pared down, is, in all conscience, small enough; but the presiding genius of Wesleyan legislation deemed even this shadow of a right dangerous without further limitations, which are to the following effect:—

"The right of memorial on the subject of our general legislation, thus recognized and allowed, shall however be exercised under the following regulations, which *the conference considers* to be both sound and reasonable in principle, and *really necessary*, in order to the prevention of *great and serious evils*: First, *Notice in writing* shall be given to the superintendent, for the information of all who desire it, at least three days before the day of meeting, of the *precise* subject on which it is intended to propose that any memorial shall be sent to the conference; and no proposal, of which such timely notice has not been given, shall be allowed to be brought forward for that year. Secondly, All memorials requesting any change in our laws, shall be limited to *such changes only as are consistent with the essential principles* of Wesleyan Methodism, and *within the pale of our established constitution*. The conference cannot fairly be required to receive any propositions of a manifestly revolutionary character, or which are wholly subversive of that system of doctrine or discipline which has been confided to them by Mr. Wesley as a sacred deposit; and which, as they believe, has been also committed to their keeping by the providence and grace of God. Thirdly, The rules, whose alteration, repeal, or enactment, may become the subject of discussion and memorial in such meetings, must be such rules only as have operated, or are intended to operate, in the *government of the societies at large* . . . The disciplinary jurisdiction of the preachers over each other, and *their right of regulating among themselves all that relates peculiarly and specifically to the Christian ministry and the pastoral office*, are not to be considered as subjects open to the official interference by memorial of the meetings now constituted. Fourthly, *The special meeting of one circuit shall not be at liberty to intermeddle with the local affairs or proceedings of any other circuit or circuits; respecting*

which its information must often, of necessity, be exceedingly partial and defective, and its interference consequently, if attempted, must be as useless, and even mischievous, as it would be *culpably officious, offensive, and unconstitutional*. With these necessary limitations the superintendents are directed to *allow*, in meetings constituted as aforesaid, the *free* (!!) and friendly discussions of our people, and to take charge of any memorial from them, *couched in proper and respectful terms*."—*Grindrod's Compendium*, pp. 164, 165.

The plain English of all which amounts to this: If you happen to be not a mere Methodist, but a *steward*, you may *once a year* express a *wish to petition*; but take care you ask for *no essential change*, and presume not to petition about any thing *specifically relating to the Christian ministry and the pastoral office*. Be *precise* in the notice you give, and *respectful* in your language, for fear of your petition being quashed on either of these grounds. Your notice is *not to be given publicly*, but to the superintendent; he is not to publish it, but to show it to *those who desire it*: least of all, shall you make interest *in other circuits* for co-operation, even in the way of petition. With all these limitations you are *free to petition*; and the conference is equally *free to take no notice* of your petition. Here is a specimen for you of the principle of reform consistently carried out! Why! the law of the Medes and Persians, "which altereth not," was a mere joke to this; and if "Father Wesley" had been kept one-tenth part as tightly within the traces of Church order, as his followers are kept within those of connexional law, Wesleyanism would have been "like the untimely fruit of a woman,"—it would never have "seen the sun."

But let it not be supposed, for all this, that Wesleyanism is either unchangeable or unchanged. Far from it. To the people, indeed, it is hard as stereotype; but to the hierarchy it is soft and pliant as wax. Though petitioning upwards is difficult in the extreme, decreeing downwards is the easiest thing in the world. And by a remarkable coincidence all the changes that have been made, even those which were made with a view to meet the wishes of the people, have somehow or other had the effect of increasing the importance, enlarging the powers, and consolidating the rule, of the Wesleyan hierarchy. Attempts of a different tendency have occasionally been made by spirits of a bolder cast; but they who made them, encountered Jabez, which, being interpreted, is "trouble and sorrow." In saying this, we speak not without book.

"Our divisions," says Edmund Grindrod, the "Phillimore upon Burn" of Methodism, in his centenary sermon, "have, generally, been

caused by a few men of popular consequence in our larger societies; their pretensions have assumed an air of plausibility; zeal for the Church's purity has been their avowed motive, and useful reforms in our economy their ostensible objects. But the issue has, in most cases, made it manifest, that their real design was to become the head of a party; and although they have succeeded in drawing after them, not only men of their own views, but sincere and unsuspecting persons over whom they or their partisans had acquired a previous influence, their divisive schemes have ultimately failed; *they and their families have often had cause bitterly to regret such ill-advised steps.*"—*Wesleyan Methodism viewed in Retrospect; a sermon, by Edmund Grindrod, p. 17.*

"During the last thirty years," says the same Grindrod, writing in the year 1841, in the introduction to his Compendium, "our general polity has been improved beyond all parallel in any previous period; the most important additions have been made to our code, whilst all our first principles have been sacredly guarded and preserved . . . . During this period our legislation bears intrinsic evidence of being *the production of one superior mind*: other parties may have contributed original suggestions and emendations,—but it is obvious that *one master-hand* for the last generation *has framed the great majority of the acts of our conference.* Besides many minor regulations dispersed throughout our annual minutes, the invaluable system of finance, particularly in the department of the contingent fund, the entire constitution of the Missionary Society, of the Theological Institution, and of our Sunday schools, were framed by the same honoured minister."—*Grindrod's Compendium, Introduction, pp. xiv—xvi.*

To this we add the testimony of Thomas Jackson, who designates the "honoured minister," whose "master-hand" is so obviously discernible in the Methodist legislation of the last generation, as "the ablest advocate of the true Wesleyan system:"—

"Enlargement," he continues, "upon this subject would be improper; for JABEZ BUNTING is still living, and long may he live as an ornament and pillar of the connexion! It is, however, bare justice to add, that *to him, more than to any other man since the death of Mr. Wesley, is the Methodist body indebted for carrying out its principles into practical effect, and for fixing its various institutions upon a permanent and liberal base.*"—*Jackson's Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism, p. 247.*

These testimonies of the great conservative Wesleyans, as to the ascendancy of Dr. Bunting over the conference, and through it over the whole connexion, are abundantly confirmed, though in a very different strain, by the impotent howls of the "liberals" who have at various times smarted under his presidential lash. These complain that "Mr. Sovereign Pontiff Bunting" has it all his own way; they denounce him as one who "has no other aim,

no higher ambition, than to be the only figure among cyphers ;” they call him a “notorious trickster,” an “ecclesiastical Lord Brougham.” The most dire provocation which Dr. Bunting gave to the unruly spirits in the connexion, and to some who stood high enough to place their claims to power in rivalry with his own,—that which brought the stability of the connexion into the greatest jeopardy, and ultimately was the means of consolidating it most completely, through the legal judgments pronounced in Dr. Warren’s Chancery suit, which arose indirectly out of this matter,—was the scheme for the establishment of a Theological Institution advanced by Dr. Bunting in the year 1833, and carried into effect in the year 1835. From Dr. Warren’s pamphlet, published on that occasion, and the answers to it by Cubitt and Crowther, it plainly appears, on one hand, that the projected institution was calculated, as well as intended, to effect a material change in the character of the Wesleyan ministry, and, on the other hand, that to this change no exceptions were taken by Dr. Warren, till he found that the institution was to be monopolized by Dr. Bunting, and himself excluded from its management. Nothing short of the fact that the preachers in the conference were, according to the expression of one of the objectors, “led captive by the president at his will,” can account for the adoption of the scheme, in spite of the strong elements of opposition which naturally existed against it among the preachers. The following passage, taken from the fourth of a series of “Letters to Local Preachers,” will be more instructive than any thing we could pen, as to the formidable nature of that opposition in a community constituted as the Wesleyan body is :—

“Is it to be supposed that they [the senior preachers] can have a real wish for an institution that, if it succeed, will infallibly make some youths really superior, and make many more think themselves superior, to men of threescore? How they will like chopping logic with literary puppies, I will not inquire. But to be really over-topped and over-shadowed by a Hoxton breed of spiritual ‘admirable Crichtons’—will this be agreeable to flesh and blood? Will ‘superintendents of thirty years’ standing,’ so long the absolute monarchs of the tea-table—will they be content to have young whipper-snappers, fresh from college, perhaps only at home during the vacation, appealed to, in their presence, for the settlement of knotty points of criticism and controversy? Will they not rue the day when they unwittingly lent themselves to the establishment of an institution which will upset the prestige of a grave countenance, a solemn and deliberate elocution, and an arm-chair? Have they well considered what is to be taught in this *Theological* Institution? Let them read again the long list of learned items. Let them bear in mind that all these languages, and all these



arts and sciences, with 'the science of salvation,' and 'the arts of holy living' in the bargain, are to be taught by the encyclopædic genius of John Hannah, and then—tremble for the duration of their time-hallowed honours." — *Stephens's Methodist Magazine for December, 1834*, p. 244.

The idea of "a seminary for labourers" appears to have been entertained as far back as the year 1744, under the influence of Charles Wesley, who was more anxious than his brother to secure the appointment of preachers duly qualified, and at the same time pledged to remain in the communion of the Church. Nothing, however, was done in John Wesley's lifetime: some fifteen years after his death the conference caused a pamphlet to be published "on the importance of adopting a plan of instruction for those preachers who are admitted upon trial in the Methodist connexion;" in 1823 and the following years, the conference appointed a "Committee of Education," to report on the subject; but nothing effectual was done till the conference of 1833 directed a committee of twenty preachers—*quorum Jabez pars magna fuit*—"to arrange a plan for the better education of our junior preachers." Of the plan so arranged, and adopted by conference in 1834, the following are the most important features:—

"That, as soon as practicable after the conference of each year, all the young preachers placed on the president's list of reserve shall be subjected to an *additional* examination by a committee consisting of the preachers of the London district, or as many of them as can conveniently assemble; that this committee shall decide which of the candidates it may be proper to admit into the institution-house, and which of them shall still be kept on the list of reserve, for the immediate service of the home and foreign work. . . .

"That the plan of tuition for resident students shall comprehend as many of the following subjects as, on a careful consideration of the previous attainments and probable opportunities of the several students, may be deemed suitable and practicable; namely:—

"1. English grammar, composition, and elocution; geography and history; and elementary instruction in the mathematics, natural philosophy, and chemistry, and in logic, and the philosophy of the mind.

"2. Theology; including the evidences, doctrines, duties, and institutions of Christianity, and having particular reference to *those views of the Christian system, in its application to experimental and practical religion, which are held by our body* to be conformable to the Holy Scriptures. This will also include the general principles of Church order and government, connected with *a distinct exposition of our own established discipline, and of the proper methods of administering it for the purity, edification, and preservation of our societies*; and a view of the nature and importance of the pastoral office and care, with *special reference to the duties and engagements of a Methodist preacher*.



“ 3. The elements of biblical criticism ; the best methods of critically studying the Scriptures ; the rules and principles to be observed in their interpretation ; Hebrew, Greek, and Roman antiquities ; and the outlines of ecclesiastical history.

“ 4. The most useful methods of *direct preparation for the pulpit*, and general instructions for the *composition and acceptable delivery of sermons*.

“ 5. Such instruction in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, as may enable the students to read and study the Sacred Scriptures in their original tongues, and prepare them for the successful pursuit of further classical and biblical knowledge, when they shall be called into circuits or missions. This branch of instruction may, however, be wholly omitted, at the discretion of the officers of the institution, if, on examining the student at his first admission, or subsequently, they shall deem it most expedient to confine his attention to the English and theological classes.

“ That the care and assistance of this institution shall be extended also to those candidates for the Christian ministry who cannot be received into the institution-house ; for which purpose they shall be regarded as non-resident students. The object of this care and assistance shall be to direct them in the prosecution of their literary and theological studies ; to aid them in the purchase of suitable books, according to a list to be prepared for that purpose ; and to make provision for their regular annual examination by one of the officers of the institution, assisted by such person or persons as the conference may appoint, in reference to the studies which shall have been enjoined.”—*Grindrod's Compendium*, pp. 227—229.

Upon this plan an institution-house was established for about thirty students at Hoxton ; in 1838, the establishment was transferred to a larger house at Stoke Newington ; and in 1839 a sum of 27,500*l.* was appropriated from the centenary fund for the erection of a splendid institution-house at Richmond, in Surrey, and the formation of a branch establishment for the north, at Didsbury, near Manchester. Besides the tutors, there is a governor, “ specially charged with the oversight of the Christian character and conduct of the students,” who is “ also expected to instruct them in the general economy and discipline of Wesleyan Methodism, and the nature and duties of the pastoral office.” There is, moreover, in each of the two branches, a “ house sub-committee” and a “ weekly board.” The whole institution, including both branches, is “ placed under a president and a committee of management :” the power of the president is indicated rather than defined ; he “ exercises a watchful oversight of all its proceedings, and an affectionate care for all its interests ;” lastly, the president is—Dr. Jabez Bunting.

<sup>1</sup> See *Grindrod's Compendium*, pp. 230—236 *passim*.

"He is now, therefore," says the Report of the Conference of 1834, in Stephens's Magazine, "the great Jove of the connexion. His power in conference is only less than supreme. In the college, which will be the nursery of future conferences, it will be supreme. Such, and such only, as he is pleased to admit, will be admitted; and such, and such only, as he is pleased to retain, will be retained. The motto of the gateway will be, 'No Dissenters, no Clarkites, no Liberals, admitted here!'"—*Stephens's Methodist Magazine for September, 1834, p. 158.*

The establishment of the institution is, however, not the only measure adopted by Dr. Bunting for the purpose of giving to the Wesleyan ministry a character altogether different from that which it had had under John Wesley. John Wesley had set on foot an irregular ministry in aid of the Church; Jabez Bunting's object was to create a regular ministry in separation from the Church. Under the inspiration of this thought he had hardly set the Theological Institution going, before he proposed, in the conference held at Birmingham in 1836, of which he was the president, the adoption of the rite of imposition of hands in the ordination of ministers. This was altogether a new thing in the connexion. With the exception of a few preachers irregularly ordained, as has been before noted, by John Wesley, in conjunction with other "*ordained* ministers," on the plea that he could see no difference between the presbyterate and the episcopate<sup>5</sup>; the Methodist preachers were all laymen, admitted from time to time, first on trial, and afterwards into full connexion. In the case of missionaries only, sent forth to a distance,

<sup>5</sup> Among the inconsistencies which float about in the Methodist system, plentiful as herrings in the season, is the fact that in the travestie of "The form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests and deacons," appended to "The Sunday Service of the Methodists, with other occasional services," an edition of which, published in 1845, lies before us, "The form and manner of ordaining of elders" is followed by "The form of ordaining a superintendent,"—the firm conviction notwithstanding, which, upon the authority of Lord King's "Account of the Primitive Church," John Wesley saw good to entertain, that "bishops and presbyters are the same order." The composition, or rather mutilation, of this service is exceedingly curious. The very name of the office which is the subject of it, is painfully "shirked" as long as possible. In the Collect instead of "all bishops, the pastors of thy Church," we read "all the ministers and pastors of thy Church," making a special prayer general, to avoid the appearance of a special inconsistency. Next follows the omission of the first of the two epistles, that from 1 Tim. iii. 1, as containing the obnoxious word "bishop;"—instead of "another bishop," we have "another elder," appointed to read the gospel:—but all in vain; for, at last, in the act of presentation there is no possibility of escaping from the untoward and new-fangled appellation. Two elders have to approach the ordaining superintendent with the words: "We present unto you this godly" ("well-learned" is, not without good reason, left out) "man to be ordained a superintendent." The Rubicon once passed, the word is freely used afterwards. The prayer after the Litany speaks of "the work and ministry of a superintendent;" and the formula of ordination runs thus: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a superintendent in the Church of God," &c.

kind of ordination was occasionally used ; but even for this the special permission of the conference had in each instance to be obtained. In accordance with this original character of the Methodist ministers as lay preachers, the use of gowns and bands, and the assumption of the title "reverend," were forbidden, and that under pain of exclusion from the connexion'. The former was subsequently permitted in exceptional cases, to be determined by the conference ; and the title "reverend" was assumed, by a vote of conference, if we mistake not, as far back as the year 1721. But, although both in regard to these externals, and in regard to the irregular administration of the sacraments, and especially of the Holy Communion, in many of the chapels, the Wesleyan ministers had gradually assimilated themselves to other dissenting ministers, assuming the functions, titles, and dress of the clergy, still the general body of Methodist preachers employed in the home circuits were, avowedly and by rule, unordained men ; and Dr. Bunting himself, on the occasion of his introducing the subject to the conference at Birmingham, had to acknowledge "that he had not himself been ordained by the imposition of hands." Notwithstanding this palpable anomaly of the proposal, the conference assented to it almost unanimously. The discussion which took place on this occasion, and of which a condensed report appeared at the time in the "Watchman" newspaper', is extremely curious, and illustrative, as, on the one hand, of the inconsistency of Methodism, so, on the other hand, of its lofty and unwarrantable pretensions. Throughout, the imposition of hands was spoken of as nothing more than "a scriptural circumstance," which it was not expedient to omit any longer in the admission of their ministers into full connexion. Dr. Bunting in his introductory remarks, characterized it as "a practice of great authority, and of great antiquity, which was observed by the Universal Church, and tended to raise the character of the Christian ministry." He volunteered a disclaimer of his having any intention, scheme, or plan," in mentioning the subject now, which he had done eight years before. He did not consider the imposition of hands "essential to the validity of ordination," but as a scriptural circumstance, the responsibility of omitting

*Minutes of Several Conversations between the Rev. JOHN WESLEY, A.M., and others in connexion with him, containing the form of discipline established among preachers and people in the Methodist Societies,"* London, 1797. Reprinted for the Methodist Book-room, 1840. Section xxix. 1.

Of that paper, the "Watchman" of Wednesday, August 10, 1836, could hardly now be procured out of the connexion, as the publication of the report at that time disapproved as an act of indiscretion. But the whole document has been revived by the indefatigable editor of the "Church Intelligencer," who reprinted it in the Intelligencer of December 29, 1841, and January 5, 1842.

which he wished to remove from himself to the conference." Other speakers were seized with the infection of the conscientious scruple mentioned by the president, and expressed themselves "unwilling to take the responsibility of longer delay," which, one of them thought, would be "a calamity." One observed, that it might now be done with safety, which had not been the case two years before; alluding to the period of Dr. Warren's opposition to the Theological Institution, upon this ground, among others, that he suspected the president designate of the institution of "episcopal propensities," and feared it would lead to the introduction of "an illegitimate episcopal ordination, a cassocked race of ecclesiastics, and whatever else might render this new, this improved edition of Methodism imposing and magnificent in the eyes of the world!" Referring to the expulsion of Dr. Warren and his party, which had since taken place, the speaker before mentioned said, "Now the *matériel* of strife was gone, and it would be well to settle the question at once." Some of the speakers broached a doctrine of "the apostolic succession," peculiarly their own; which enabled one of them, on whom hands had never been laid, to "tell a clergyman, who interrogated him on the subject, that he was as fully ordained as himself;" while another, who, being a missionary, had been ordained with imposition of hands, (unauthorized hands, of course,) declined the offer of Bishop Heber to "re-ordain" the Methodist missionaries, on the ground that "he and his brethren had already received a scriptural ordination." One mentioned the fact, that the Methodists "differed in their present practice from the Churches of Christ at large," as an argument that weighed much with him; while another "cordially supported" the proposition, on the ground that "Methodism was now a far better thing than when he first knew it," (he was admitted in 1799,) "the plans which had been adopted had mended it." By some the connexion of this measure with the consolidation of Methodism into a separate body was boldly avowed: "Formerly they had had a sufficient ground for their peculiar mode of ordination, in the circumstance that they did not consider themselves a Church, but a religious society; but in their present circumstances those reasons were taken away." "Though it had been so long omitted, yet the practice of imposition of hands was quite Wesleyan. Had Mr. Wesley lived, he would undoubtedly have admitted by imposition of hands. Mr. Wesley considered his preachers helpers, not ministers; their position was altered; they were not auxiliary to another body, they were a body themselves; and it was right

\* See "*Remarks on the Wesleyan Theological Institution for the Education of the Junior Preachers*, by Samuel Warren, LL.D." London, 1834. p. 23.

they should hold the pastoral office identical and complete." a similar effect another observed, that "the times required it; circumstances in which they were placed required, on their strength and unity." One thought, "if the circumstance (imposition of hands) would lay the responsibilities of the office weightily upon the consciences of those who were introduced, it ought to be generally adopted:" another, that "the rite of ordination, accompanied by imposition of hands, was more impressive and more useful to the ministers so ordained, and more resting to the people, than their former practice:" a third, "the effect on the public mind would be most favourable."

Now expressed doubt and hesitation as to whether the right for it was come; whether it would not be "desirable to wait another year." Two only made the obvious logical discovery, that what was sauce for the young goslings, would be also for the old ganders: they both, however, approved of the proposal to superadd "the circumstance;" one of them observing, that "he had scarcely considered his own ordination complete for the want of it;" and the other, "that if the imposition of hands was necessary for others, it was necessary for self." But such scruples as these were blown to atoms by the answerable eloquence of Mr. Newton, the secretary of the conference on the occasion in question, who "would say for himself that if he did not believe his own ordination, in all its essential parts, valid, he could not justify himself in administering the ordinances of the Christian Church." There was no gaining such an argument as this; and a resolution, moved by the secretary, was therefore carried, with only two dissentients, to the effect, "That the preachers who are this year to be publicly admitted into full connexion, shall be ordained by imposition of hands; that this shall be our standing rule and usage in future years; and that any rule of a contrary nature which may be in existence, shall be, and is hereby, rescinded."

The only objection which no one thought of, was the palpable fiction, that Dr. Bunting the president, Mr. Atterton the ex-president, and Mr. Newton the secretary, having none of them received any gift or commission for the exercise of this high pontifical office, had neither ecclesiastical authority, nor spiritual power, to do what they pretended to do<sup>1</sup>. So far were the members of the conference from discerning or even suspecting this,

See also "*Grindrod's Compendium*," p. 15.

The following dialogue, which the "*Church Intelligencer*" appends to the text, is not amiss:—"Arrah, Paddy, what 'ill you and me do, if the ship goes to pieces in open sea, and neither of us able to swim?" "Keep yourself easy, Avichore, av the worst comes to the worst, you can hould me up, an' I'll hould you up, an' we'll both be safe."

so completely were they "led captive by the president at his will," that one of the speakers alleged it as one of his reasons, which, he said, "he stated with warmth and honesty," that "he should like it to be done under the presidency of Dr. Bunting;" and another "coincided in the remark," that among the particular reasons which showed that "a more befitting time could not be expected to exist," was to be reckoned "the circumstance that at this peculiar juncture Dr. Bunting should fill that chair." As for ourselves, we do not feel the slightest temptation to question the appropriateness of this coincidence,—if coincidence it was,—any more than that of the locality in which the transaction took place. Considering the general character of the articles manufactured in Birmingham, "such," says the prophetic soul of Hugh Murray, who published his *Encyclopædia of Geography* in the year 1834, "as, individually, appear unworthy of being named, yet astonish and dazzle by their magnitude, when half the world is to be supplied with them;" we cannot but think that the conference showed an unusual and praiseworthy degree of attention to the canons of type and allegory by selecting that town in preference to any other, for originating a succession which takes its rise not from St. Peter, St. John, or St. Paul, but from St. Jabez. Besides, it was unquestionably a safer place to do the deed in, if it was to be done at all, than the City Road Chapel in London would have been; for had the ordination scene been enacted there, close to the spot where the bones of the "Venerable Founder" repose, it would not have been in the least surprising, if to the many ghost stories with which his *Journal* abounds, he had added a posthumous one, by rising out of his grave, confronting his undutiful sons, Bunting, Atterton, and Newton, and addressing them in that well-known strain of his, "Oh, ye sons of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram! know ye not that 'no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.' Oh, contain yourselves within your own bounds!"

Thus far, viewing the matter in the light in which the parties themselves affected to regard it, as a mere question of outward ceremony, turning upon the omission or addition of a "scriptural circumstance," this new "succession," which, like the *Orchideæ*, has no root in the ground, but draws its sustenance from the "ambient air," is simply ridiculous. But we confess to a very different feeling, to a feeling of strong indignation, which took possession of us, and which, we doubt not, our readers will share with us, when in the latter part of the report we found the solemn Ordination Service of our Church profaned—we can call it by no milder term—for the purpose of consolidating the schism commenced by Wesley, and perfected by Bunting, by means of



counterfeit ordination. To our mind there is something exceedingly awful in a man who has received no authority or commission whatever to do so, standing up as in the presence of God, and presuming to exercise a power, which even the imposition of apostolic hands did not confer in all cases, but only in those in which it was intended to convey with the gift also the authority of transmission. When "the president" gave utterance to these solemn words, "Mayest thou receive the Holy Ghost, to qualify thee for the office and work of a Christian minister, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy sacraments, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost!" he either meant something, or he meant nothing. If the latter,—if he did not mean what those words express, all we can say is, we shudder to think that any man, but especially one taking upon himself the office of a minister, should presume to take the name of God the Holy Ghost so deliberately in vain. If the former,—if he meant what the words imply, then we ask, and we desire to ask reverently, Who is Dr. Bunting, that he can do that which Philip the Deacon—(a man on whom the Apostles themselves had laid their hands, a man who wrought miracles, who healed the sick, and cast out devils, and who by his preaching converted the whole city of Samaria)—could not do, but, after baptizing his converts, left Peter and John to come down to Samaria, for the express purpose of doing it, because he had either commission nor power to do it himself? Who is Dr. Bunting, that he fancies he may arrogate to himself the gift which even Simon the Sorcerer understood, was not to be had merely for the challenging of it, and therefore offered to purchase with money? Does Dr. Bunting really imagine that God the Holy Ghost is thus at the beck and call of any man that may choose to originate or to consolidate a schism? that He who is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all Churches of the saints, will bestow the gifts vouchsafed to the Church "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," on the invocation of a ringleader of schism, upon the teachers and messengers of schism, whom he, Dr. Bunting, sees fit to send forth into the world for the subverting of men's souls, and the corrupting of them from the simplicity which is in Christ? When Dr. Bunting presumes to say to the deluded young men who are kneeling before him, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to administer the holy Sacraments in our congregations!" we, humble as we are, may surely presume to ask, Whence did Dr. Bunting get the authority which he so magnificently dispenses?



"Whence hath this man all these mighty works?" or, which is more to the purpose, Whence hath he all this mighty effrontery!

We are really sorry to use so great plainness of speech concerning a man who must be admitted on all hands to be an exceedingly able and whom we are quite willing to believe a well-meaning man. But there is no help for it. If men will do wilfully and presumptuously with the highest and holiest gifts of God, nothing remains for those who know the unspeakable value of those gifts, but to protest and to remonstrate, as loudly as they can, against the profanation.

And, after all, what a bastard system it is! At one end of the Methodist preachers' probation there is the beautiful, scriptural, Ordination Service of the Church, clumsily mutilated where its inapplicability to a schismatical communion is too glaring even for Wesleyan inconsistency; and what is there at the other end of it? A form of examination as unlike the sober and solemn offices of our Liturgy as can well be imagined,—a form which sets out with such high-flown notions of Christian perfection, that the ripest Christian might well scruple to answer the questions here propounded to novices in the work of the ministry, and too often, probably, novices in grace too; and which descends afterwards to the lowest *bathos* of personal inquiry, unsuitable, we should think, at all times for candidates to the ministry, but quite preposterous when regard is had to the lofty degree of Christian attainment which the parties subjected to this inquiry are supposed to be possessed of. But our readers shall have an opportunity of judging for themselves. The interrogatory commences with the following questions:—

"Have you a lively faith in Christ? Do you enjoy a *clear manifestation* of the love of God to your soul? Have you *constant power over all sin*? Do you expect to be *perfected* in love in *this life*? Do you really desire and earnestly seek it? Are you resolved to devote yourself wholly to God, and to his work?"—*Minutes of Several Conversations containing the form of Discipline*. London, 1797, sect. iii. *Grindrod's Compendium*, p. 13.

We should, in our simplicity, have thought, that a man who had "*constant power over all sin*," could not be otherwise than "*perfected in love*;" and we should therefore have conceived the latter of those two questions to be superfluous; at least, if the former was answered in the affirmative. But though in this we should be mistaken, it can hardly be doubted that he who should be able to answer the whole of these questions satisfactorily, would be a very eminent Christian indeed; a much greater Phoenix of grace than John Wesley seems to have thought, when he framed

these questions. But lofty as is the conception which the unwary might be led to form of the character of a ministry, to the very novices and candidates of which such questions are put, there is a sudden descent, like that of the monkey in the parachute; for within six lines only of the former questions, we meet with the following inquiry, "Do you take no snuff, tobacco, or drams?" To ask a man whether he carries a snuff-box, or, as the case may be, his paper-cornet of snuff, whether he sports a pipe, or takes "a drop" now and then, we should, as a rule, have thought derogatory to the high office to which the examinee is supposed to aspire. But to ask one who is, *per hypothesin*, "perfected in love," having "constant power over all sin," and "a clear manifestation of the love of God to his soul," whether he be not a snuff-taker, a smoker, or a tippler, is an anti-climax of perfectibility which altogether surpasses our comprehension. We ask any impartial person to compare this interrogatory of Methodism with the questions addressed to candidates in our ordination office, and if he does not think it a plain case of

*Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam* " &c.

or rather, *asininam*, if it would suit the metre, we make him a present of the whole argument.

There is another point, however, of this mixed ordination office, which we must not overlook, and in regard to which the two component parts are made to harmonize rather better; the qualifications, namely, of the candidate in respect of Wesleyan orthodoxy. In the first examination this point stands thus:—

"Do you know the Methodist plan of doctrine and discipline? Have you read the 'Plain Account of the Methodists?' the 'Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion?' Do you know the Rules of the Society and of the Bands? Are you determined, by the help of God, to keep them?"

Here follows the snuff, tobacco, and dram question; after which the interrogatory continues:—

"Have you read and seriously considered the Minutes of the Conference? especially have you considered the Rules of a Helper? and, above all, the first, tenth, and twelfth? and will you keep them for conscience sake?"—*Minutes of Several Conversations containing the form of Discipline*, sect. iii. *Grindrod's Compendium*, p. 13.

Let us see, in the next place, how this point is handled in the "Ordination Service," as adapted to the peculiar wants of the connexion. Immediately after the question as to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, we there have three questions, which, for the more edification of our readers, we shall give with the parallel

question as it stands in the original Ordination Service, by the side of the amended form adopted by the conference:—

**The Church Form :**

Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same?

**The Methodist Form :**

But as you are to exercise your ministry under the direction of the Wesleyan conference, I have further to inquire, whether you have read the first four volumes of Mr. Wesley's Sermons, and his notes on the New Testament, and whether you believe that the system of doctrine therein contained is in accordance with the Holy Scriptures?

I have also to ask you, whether you have read the Large Minutes, and believe that the general system of discipline contained therein is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures; and whether you will maintain and enforce it in the societies which shall be committed to your charge?

Will you, then, give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded?"—*Grindrod's Compendium*, pp. 16, 17.

John Wesley thought the Articles of the Church of England much too cumbrous; and accordingly he reduced their number from thirty-nine to twenty-five, taking care to strike out among others the Article touching the three Creeds, and that which recommends the Homilies. Look, then, at the consistency of imposing upon the necks of his followers, who could not bear the weight of thirty-nine Articles and two books of Homilies in one volume of moderate size, by way of articles of belief and terms of communion, a select, and by no means portable library, of which the following is a catalogue:—

1. Plain Account of the Methodists.
2. Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion.
3. The Rules of the Society.
4. The Rules of the Bands.
5. The Rules for Helpers.
6. The Large Minutes of Conference.
7. Four Volumes of Mr. Wesley's Sermons.
8. Mr. Wesley's Notes to the New Testament.

No less than eight documents, some of them voluminous, constitute together the test of Methodist orthodoxy. And will any one after this listen, without crying "shame," to Methodists arguing

on the principle of "the Bible, and nothing but the Bible," and reviling in the most uncompromising terms any thing upon which they can by any perversion of language fix the ugly name "tradition?" What would be said of the Church, if she were to impose such a burden of tradition upon her ministers? But the traditions of John Wesley may be imposed to any extent. His followers, who strain at the gnat of the compendious Church test, greedily swallow the camel of the voluminous test of Methodism.

To have a test of orthodoxy, however, is one thing, and to have an orthodox test quite another thing. And on inquiry it will be found, that whatever the Methodists may profess as to their doctrinal agreement with the Church of England, they are far, very far, from being sound in the faith. Indeed, the very fact of four volumes of Sermons, and an edition of the New Testament with Notes, by an individual, however eminent, of the eighteenth century, being put in the place of the ancient Catholic safeguards of truth, and of the Articles of faith of that Church of which he was, and, in profession at least, continued to be, a member, is of itself sufficient to raise an unfavourable presumption as to the soundness of the doctrines which he propagated among his followers. In order to appreciate the full weight which attaches to this substitution of John Wesley's Sermons and Notes for all other doctrinal standards, it should be clearly understood, that in reality none of the formularies of faith of the Church are of any authority in the Wesleyan body. Even those which are retained in the Wesleyan edition of the Book of Common Prayer, are no where recognized as standards of faith, they are not so much as mentioned in the examinations and other preliminaries to the admission of ministers. They stand upon the same footing as the entire Liturgy; that is, they are optional, or worse than optional, throughout the connexion. According to the statements of both the liturgical and the anti-liturgical party, the Liturgy is held in much contempt by the majority, even in those places where it is used in the chapels; it being the common practice for a part of the congregation not to make their appearance till after the Liturgy, when the extemporaneous prayers and the preaching commence. Except, therefore, that they are bound up with "the Sunday Service," even the fragments of our Articles retained by John Wesley have no existence among the Wesleyans, much less do they constitute their rule of faith.

No less significant than this fact, is the positive rejection by John Wesley of two of the Creeds and fourteen of the Articles; and a variety of mutilations and alterations in those which are

retained. To enumerate all these, and to enter upon a review of the whole field of Wesleyan theology, would be a task far exceeding our limits, and one from which we feel sure our readers will gladly dispense both us and themselves. It will be sufficient to note, that even the Divinity and humanity of our blessed Lord are points on which the soundness of the connexion is very questionable. The Arianism of Dr. Adam Clarke is too well known to call for any comment in this place; and the spread of it in the connexion, and especially among the local preachers, was at one time a matter of serious alarm to the orthodox party. There is a curious testimony on record, on this subject, according to which the leaven of rationalism is extensively at work in the Wesleyan body. We give it as we find it in a tract entitled "Methodism as it is," which is a reprint of an article in the "Eclectic Review" for August, 1846. It is there stated, that Mr. John Gordon, formerly a Wesleyan minister, and now a Unitarian minister at Coventry, gave it as his opinion at a recent meeting of the Unitarian Association, that Unitarianism would receive considerable accessions from the Wesleyan body; and among the reasons he assigned for entertaining that expectation, was the following:—

"The other ground on which he rested his opinion was, the peculiar constitution of Methodism in raising up a body of local teachers in every circuit or division. There was thus formed a strong body of individuals accustomed on every Sabbath-day to occupy the pulpit in places of worship. They were *thinking men*, so far as matters of religion were concerned; and there was no other sect in the kingdom possessed of such a body of men, habituated to *reflect* on subjects of this kind. People were disposed to look upon Methodists as an ignorant body of men; but he could tell them, that so far as his own experience went, he never knew a Methodist circuit where there was not *some individual connected with the local preachers able to read the Greek Testament in the original.*"

To estimate this fact at its full value, the reader must remember that "a little learning is a dangerous thing," and that there is no criticism more bold and sweeping than that of the *tyro* who is halting between the Accidence and the Syntax of his Greek Grammar, and gets the pronunciation as well as the sense of the text he criticizes, from that extremely useful manual "The Englishman's Greek Concordance,"—the very sort of scholarship, we should think, which is likely to find its way second-hand into the pulpits of the local preachers, through the Hellenic "coaching" of "individuals connected with them." We are accordingly quite prepared to admit the correctness of the conclusion which the speaker before quoted drew from his premises.

"Therefore," he continued, "he thought that he was right in saying, that Unitarianism, when it could get hold among such a body of men as this, was more likely to spread among them, than in any other class of the Christian community."—*Methodism as it is. Fifth edition.* London, 1847. p. 21.

Of the actual existence of this evil in the connexion, and that to such an extent as to call for an authoritative check upon it from the conference, we have further and still more authentic proof in the following Minute adopted by the conference of the year 1827:—

"It is also the *acknowledged right*, and, under existing circumstances, the *indispensable duty*, of the president of the conference, for the time being, to examine particularly upon the doctrine of the Eternal Sonship of our Lord Jesus Christ, as it is stated by Mr. Wesley, especially in his notes upon the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, every preacher proposed to be admitted into full connexion, and to require an explicit and unreserved declaration of his assent to it, as a truth revealed in the inspired oracles."—*Grindrod's Compendium*, p. 14.

In connexion with this subject it deserves to be noted, that both the Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds are wholly omitted from the Wesleyan Prayer-book, and that in the second Article the words, "Begotten from everlasting of the Father," are expunged. The same article also betrays the further unsoundness of Wesleyan doctrine on the point of our blessed Lord's humanity; for after the clause "took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin," the words "of her substance" are cancelled; and that this omission is designed, is apparent from a similar omission in the "Proper Preface" for Christmas-day, in which after the clause "who by the operation of the Holy Ghost was made very man," the words "of the substance of the Virgin Mary his mother" are again left out; all which agrees with the definition of Christ's coming in the flesh, in the Wesleyan Catechism:—

"The Son of God came into the world by assuming the body which God had prepared for him, and was born of a woman."—*The Catechisms of the Wesleyan Methodists, compiled and published by order of the Conference*, No. II. Appendix, sect. 2, q. 2.

In the same way the "going down of Christ into hell" is wholly kept out of sight: the Article on the subject is suppressed altogether; the Catechism, No. II. sect. 4, q. 6, in enumerating the different points of Christ's humiliation, speaks of "his being buried, and continuing under the power of death for a time," but is wholly silent as to his descent into hell; and the Catechism No. II., Appendix, sect. 2, goes no further than his burial in

q. 36, and in q. 37 simply states, that "He rose from the dead, after he had lain three days in the grave." From John Wesley's Notes to the different passages in the New Testament, which bear upon this question, especially that on Acts ii. 27, it is quite clear that he did not believe "that ever our Lord went into hell" (or "hades"); and yet he retained the clause that asserts it, in the Apostles' Creed! While John Wesley thus rejected or evaded the direct testimony of Holy Scripture on a point that has ever been believed in the Church, he ventured upon many fanciful statements respecting the invisible world, being rather too prone "to intrude into those things which he had not seen;" and in like manner in the Catechisms published by order of the conference, there are,—on the nature of paradise, of hell and heaven, on the condition of fallen angels, and on the state of the soul after death,—many statements which, in the dogmatical form in which they are couched, are extremely hazardous, some positively erroneous, and others decidedly apocryphal.

That baptism and regeneration are kept widely apart, and consequently the doctrinal statements respecting either of them most defective and unsatisfactory, is no more than might be expected from such a quarter: the Article, the Catechism, and the baptismal offices, have all undergone abundant mutilations to bring them down to the standard of Wesleyan unbelief in the grace of baptismal regeneration; nor are the statements concerning the other sacrament much more satisfactory. And closely connected with this is the extreme unsoundness touching the corruption of man's nature by sin, and the possibility of his attaining in this life a state of absolute spiritual perfection, being wholly freed from all sin. The curtailment of Article IX. of our Church is characteristic of this point: the statement that "the flesh lusteth alway contrary to the spirit," that "therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation," is wholly cut away; and so is the clause following, in which it is said that "this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated." On the contrary, the doctrine of "entire sanctification," or "the state of being entirely cleansed from sin, so as to love God with all our heart and mind and soul and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves<sup>2</sup>," is strongly inculcated, as the doctrine which Wesleyanism is "more particularly desirous to propagate;" and it continues to be insisted on in theory, being prominently brought forward on all occasions, although the fact that this high state of Christian perfection is practically not realized among Wesleyans, any more than in other

<sup>2</sup> *Catechism*, No. ii. sect. 4, q. 32.



bodies of Christians, is too palpable not to be acknowledged by themselves. The following extract from a sermon, by one of their standard divines, will suffice to give our readers an idea how this and other collateral points of peculiarly Wesleyan doctrine are handled :—

“Zeal for the doctrine of present and immediate remission of sins, by faith in the atonement, and of the *direct witness of the Spirit* as the privilege of *all* believers, has distinguished us ; but *not a few of our people are living without the actual enjoyment of these spiritual blessings*. A considerable portion of one very interesting class among us, the children of Methodist families, I fear, *stop short of this state of grace* : they are moral in their conduct, amiable in their disposition and manners, attentive to divine ordinances, warmly attached to our system, respectful and affectionate to their ministers ; but *they do not restlessly aspire to all that comfort and purity* which would result from knowing, that God, for Christ’s sake, has blotted out their sins, and *daily walking in the unclouded light of his countenance*. *We earnestly contend that it is the privilege of all believers to be ‘sanctified wholly,’ in the present life*, and preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord ; but, comparatively, *how few of us [Qu. any ?] clearly experience or habitually exemplify that exalted attainment*. Pious persons of other denominations expect to be purified from all sin, and made meet for heaven *in the article of death* ; we hold, that *we may enjoy and manifest ‘perfect love’ amid the busy scenes of life* ; but, practically, we seem to regard it as some distant object of hope, to be realized at an indefinite future period.”  
—*Wesleyan Methodism viewed in Retrospect, a Centenary Sermon by Edmund Grindrod*. London, 1839. p. 22.

It would be easy to multiply these proofs of Wesleyan unsoundness, both upon the points in question, and upon others on which want of room forbids us to touch. At the same time we are quite aware that upon any given point of Wesleyan theology it would be no less easy to cull, from the voluminous writings of John Wesley himself, and of the chief luminaries of the connexion, passages of an orthodox as well as of a heterodox tendency ; it being one of the characteristic features of Wesleyanism, as exhibited both in its founder and in the connexion at large, to blow hot and cold upon the most vital questions. The evidence of this fact, which we have adduced in regard to ordination, may be considered as a fair specimen of Wesleyan inconsistency upon every other subject. It is this playing fast and loose with principles of all sorts, which enables the Wesleyans to hold that middle position between Church and dissent, which they are so studiously preserving, leaning upon either as occasion may serve, and assuming a hostile attitude towards both, whenever it suits their purpose. This is not our own opinion only ; it was that of one of the

most eminent preachers in the connexion, the late Samuel Drew, whose anonymity is the less liable to suspicion, because he was a warm & sincere supporter of this latitudinarianism of the connexion:—

“The distinguishing excellence of Methodism,” he said, in answer to the inquiry on what ground his attachment to Methodism chiefly rested, “in my estimation is, that it *requires no confession of faith from its members*, no other condition than ‘a desire to flee from the wrath to come,’ evidenced by ‘fruits meet for repentance.’ The ‘unity of the Spirit’ is thus kept ‘in the bond of peace.’ *Let the conference make uniformity in opinion the condition of membership, and Methodism will fall to pieces like a rope of sand.*”—*The Life, Character, and Literary Labours of Samuel Drew, A.M., by his eldest Son. Second edition. London, 1835. p. 518.*

Wherein, then,—this is the question which, upon such a statement from one well qualified to judge, naturally occurs,—wherein does the bond of union consist, by which Methodism is held together? The legal power of the conference may be sufficient to suppress discontent, and to cast out the refractory, but it cannot constrain people to become or to remain Methodists; there must be in the system something which attracts and rivets the masses; and, in the absence of any definite principle of Church government or of doctrine, what is that something?

As for the attraction, it consists in novelty and excitement. While the connexion continues in a state of quietude under the ordinary operation of its system, its increase is exceedingly small, and sometimes it even decreases, as in the last year, for instance, when the decrease in Great Britain amounted to upwards of two thousand. But from time to time there are what are called “revivals,” touching the spiritual value of which we cannot do better than again adduce the testimony of Mr. Drew:—

“I fear,” he wrote to one who inquired his opinion of religious revivals, “there is an artifice with some preachers and people to light up this contagious fire. I have been behind the curtain, and have seen a little of it; and am filled with disgust in proportion to the discovery. If the work be of God, He does not want the tricks I have witnessed. The question of permanency, too, presents itself. Are the present effects ultimately beneficial? Do these new converts stand? The history of past years teaches us that their apostasy has been nearly as extensive and sudden as their reformation. The benefit in such cases is lost, while the disgust excited in the minds of sober persons still remains. In many instances, I conceive, these things have created and confirmed prejudices which an age will hardly wipe away. With my present views, and with all I ever had, I cannot join in these reveries, without being an arrant hypocrite.”—*Life of Samuel Drew, pp. 517, 518.*

If we couple with this admission, as to the value of the conversions,—which take place chiefly at these revivals for the connexion disclaims proselytism from other denominations,—the complaint of Mr. Grindrod as to the tame spirit of “*worldly respectability*” which characterizes those who have been reared up in Methodism, we shall come to the conclusion that, after all, the piety of the Wesleyan body has been as much overrated as its importance in other respects. The strength of the connexion lies neither in agreement in the faith, nor in any depth of religious sympathy; the bonds that hold it together, are merely external. We speak advisedly. In the first place, there is a great deal of secularity in the constitution of the society, and an officious intermeddling with the private concerns of the members, which brings their worldly interests into bondage to their connexional superiors. Thus, for instance, we find Mr. Grindrod giving the following advice to the class-leaders, in regard to their “*duty*” towards the members of their classes:—

“*Study to gain their confidence, and teach them to consider you as their friendly advisers in the affairs of this life, as well as the helpers of their faith and joy. Let your young members know that you will expect them to apply for your counsel before they take any important step in life, whether as it relates to marriage or to business; and in any matter concerning which you may deem yourselves incompetent to decide, or which may be of such consequence as to render it desirable that the judgment of others should be obtained, apply to your ministers for their counsel. Upon general subjects their information and experience qualify them to be the best counsellors; and in affairs of trade, in which they may not be competent judges, they have access to the most upright and best-informed tradesmen in the society, and can obtain for you the advantage of their superior skill.*”—*The Duties, Qualifications, and Encouragements of Class-leaders, by the Rev. Edmund Grindrod. Fourth edition. London, 1846. pp. 25, 26.*

But not only for his temporal, for his eternal interests too, the Methodist is slavishly dependent on the system generally, and on his class in particular. The itinerancy of the preachers, while it deprives the members of that wholesome pastoral care which has not time to grow up where the ministers are constantly changed, has the effect of “*tickling the ears*” of the people, by keeping up the charm of novelty in their pulpits; a circumstance which cannot but have a powerful effect in hindering the progress of sober piety and inward religion; and, on the contrary, promoting that superficial excitement of mind which is too often mistaken for godliness. But still more prejudicial in this respect is the system of class-meetings, at which the members communicate to each other their religious “*experience*.” We cannot conceive any

plan more directly tending to deteriorate the religion of the heart,—which alone is religion in the sight of God,—than that of converting it systematically into lip-religion in the sight of men. The work of grace in the soul of man is a thing too delicate and too sacred to bear, without serious injury, such rude handling as a weekly exchange of communication on the subject must produce. Where the veil of the heart's sanctuary is so constantly lifted, and the eye of man admitted into it, we much fear, that the mystic presence, without which the sanctuary is no better than a whited sepulchre, will not long abide. It has often been observed, and there is much truth in the remark, that Methodism has many things in common with Popery. The system of experience-telling in class-meetings is one of those points of resemblance. Curiously enough, it is, like auricular confession, made a term of communion: you cannot be a Methodist without meeting in class, any more than you can be a Papist without confessing to the priest. The principle, of course, which is at the bottom of the class-system, is a different one from that on which auricular confession is founded; and yet, after all, that principle too happens to be one which is characteristic of Popery. There is in both, Popery and Methodism, a tendency to make religion outward and tangible, to the deterioration of true, inward, and spiritual religion. The difference, in this respect, between Popery and Methodism is this, that in debasing religion into an external and carnal system, Popery addresses itself to the eye, Methodism to the ear. The Papist depends for the sustenance of his religious life upon what he sees exhibited in his Church, the Methodist upon what he hears talked over in his class; in either case it is an arm of flesh that supports a factitious sentiment of religion.

Is it to some strange fatality, or to some other hidden principle, that we must attribute the striking coincidence, that Papists and Methodists are so constantly found fishing in the same waters! that, at this moment, both are proposing to convert the “districts,” into which they have respectively divided this country, into regular dioceses, and their “vicars apostolic” on the one hand, their “superintendents” on the other, into diocesan bishops! This is a question much too deep for us to attempt its solution, at what must be the close of our article. We prefer to economize the little space we have left, for more necessary considerations, and among them for the useful inquiry as to the numerical importance of the body to which Mr. Love assigns such supernatural destinies. Considering that he proposes the creation of thirty-two bishops at one stroke of his wand, Mr. Love himself is evidently sensible of the necessity of finding a population for them to oversee; and as he suspects that the bare statistics of

the connexion, as published by the authority of conference, might have a somewhat meagre look, he hits upon the ingenious device of multiplying the census of the Methodist flock by three, on the plea that to every *member* of the Wesleyan "Church" there are two *hearers*, not members, in every Methodist chapel. Without troubling ourselves to controvert this method of magnifying the "British Wesleyan Church," we shall keep to the sober reality of the figures published by conference, convinced that in doing so we run no risk of underrating the numerical strength of the connexion. Taking the successive decades of the Wesleyan era, subsequent to the year 1767,—together with that year, in which the first census was published,—the year 1791, in which John Wesley died,—and the last five years, we obtain the following tabular view of the number of circuits and members in Great Britain, to which in the later years a return of the number of ministers is added :—

Year.	Number of Circuits.	Number of Members.	Travelling.	Number of Ministers.		
				Supernumerary.	Probationary.	Total.
1767	32	23,110	..	..	..	..
1769	36	25,083	..	..	..	..
1779	48	36,567	..	..	..	..
1789	71	56,105	..	..	..	..
1791	87	58,318	..	..	..	..
1799	122	90,475	..	..	..	..
1809	212	132,086	..	..	..	..
1819	318	195,905	647	60	..	707
1829	353	247,529	749	93	..	842
1839	404	307,068	924	129	..	1053
1843	422	331,024	964	141	..	1105
1844	426	337,598	899	143	87	1129
1845	429	340,778	893	156	99	1148
1846	431	341,468	875	171	125	1171
1847	435	339,379	879	175	131	1185

Upon these data it appears, that from the first *census* of the connexion to the death of Wesley, a period of twenty-four years, the increase was at the rate of 152 per cent.; from the death of Wesley to the year 1839, the close of the decade in which the foundation of the Theological Institution and the introduction of the illegitimate ordination took place, a period of forty-eight years, at the rate of 426 per cent.; and from the year 1839 to the present year, a period of eight years, at the rate of 10.5 per cent.; and therefore, taking into account the different length of the periods, that the progress of Methodism, under the system devised by Dr. Bunting, is to the progress of Methodism under the old system since John Wesley's death, as 1 to 6.7; and to its progress in Wesley's lifetime as 1 to 4.9; or, taking the

successive decades, it appears that the increase was as follows :—

<i>Decade.</i>	<i>Increase for the Ten Years.</i>	<i>Average Annual Increase.</i>
1769—1779	45.7 per cent.	4.57 per cent.]
1779—1789	53.4	5.34
1789—1799	61.2	6.12
1799—1809	45.9	4.59
1809—1819	48.3	4.83
1819—1829	26.3	2.63
1829—1839	24.0	2.40

while in the eight years from 1839 to 1847, the increase amounts to 10.5, or 1.31 on an average, annually.

Thus it appears, that Methodism was at its acme during the latter portion of John Wesley's life, and immediately after his death ; that, ever since, its prosperity has been on the wane, more especially so since the change in the character of the Wesleyan ministry. The above figures proceed on the supposition that the population has remained stationary ; if, on the contrary, the increase of the population, which throughout Great Britain amounted to 14 per cent. between the census of 1831 and that of 1841, or on an average to 1.4 per annum, be taken into account, it will be found that Methodism has, in fact, not only become stationary, but has actually retrograded. To keep pace with the increase of population, the number of Wesleyans being 307,068 in the year 1839, ought in 1847 to have been 341,452, instead of 339,379. The decrease thus exhibited becomes still more striking, on comparing the last year with the year preceding ; there being a decrease of 2089 members, or of .006 per cent. absolutely ; or, taking the increase of population into account, of .019 per cent. This decrease of Methodism appears still more remarkable<sup>3</sup>, when regard is had to the fact, that it has been accompanied by an increase of Methodist ministers. For the sake of greater clearness, we set down the last four years, showing the rate of increase or decrease of the members, both absolutely, and in proportion to the increase of population ; together with the rate of increase in the numerical strength of the ministry :—

<i>Years.</i>	<i>Absolute Increase or Decrease.</i>	<i>Relative Increase or Decrease.</i>	<i>Increase of Ministers.</i>
1843-4	.019 ..	.005 ..	.021
1844-5	.009 ..	.. .004	.016
1845-6	.002 ..	.. .011	.020
1846-7	.. .006	.. .019	.011

<sup>3</sup> We have seen a statement, but which we have no means of authenticating, that in the United States the decrease of the numbers of the connexion amounted during the last year to no less than 50,000 ; that in the district of New York alone it amounted to 2000, and that, in consequence of this, a special "day of fasting and humiliation" was appointed by the American Conference.



While these calculations can leave no doubt that the expansive power of Methodism has ceased, they make it equally evident, that it is not to the want of ministers that the want of success is to be attributed. Making allowance for a certain number of superannuated ministers among the "supernumeraries," the average is one minister to about 300 people; and that without reckoning an innumerable host of local preachers and class-leaders. A reference to the dates at which the tide of success began to recede, confirms the view which we have taken of the probable effect of the change of system adopted under the auspices of Dr. Bunting. Nor do we stand alone in this opinion; the late Samuel Drew, to whose testimony we have before appealed, comes, upon this point also, in aid of the conclusions at which we have arrived. Speaking of the degree of stability which he conceived to belong to "the Methodist constitution," he made the following remarkable observations:—

"There are many things tending to its disorganization, against which there must be a careful watch. Our chapel debts are a mill-stone round the neck of the connexion, which, without some change of measures, may sink it to destruction. But nothing will prove so prejudicial as a *gratuitous display of power on the part of the preachers*. Against this the minds of the people will always revolt. Let them beware too of *seeking the honour that cometh from men*. In my estimation and that of many others, the preachers went down several degrees when, by a vote of conference, they assumed to themselves the title of '*Reverend*.' The permanency and strength of Methodism lie in the union of preachers and people. While their purposes and interests are identified, and God's glory their only aim, Methodism will prosper. If these be surrendered, discord will succeed to harmony."—*Life of Samuel Drew*, p. 519.

As a corollary to this prophecy of Samuel Drew, and an indication of the actual state of feeling in the connexion, the following note, appended to the inauspicious head, "Irregularities in various circuits," in the minutes of conference of the present year, is curious:—

"N. B. *Anonymous slanders*. Certain anonymous papers, bearing no name either of the authors or printers, having been circulated in our connexion during the last year, which contain many serious imputations on the integrity and disinterestedness of several of our senior ministers, and other official members of the conference, we feel it our duty to express our solemn conviction, that the spirit in which such publications originate is entirely at variance with the law of Christ; and that the brethren thus wickedly and slanderously attacked deserve our sympathy and unabated confidence. And, with reference to *the Rev. Dr. Bunting*, and *the Rev. Dr. Newton*, in particular, the conference gladly takes this opportunity of re-asserting those sentiments of affectionate respect which it has already more than once expressed in its

published resolutions, particularly in the Minutes of 1833 and 1835."  
—*Minutes of the 104th Annual Conference*, p. 153.

How long the expression of the "solemn conviction" of the conference will be able to keep down popular discontent in a body whose hierarchy has assumed a character at variance with the original constitution of that body, and with the spirit of the majority of the people belonging to it, is a question on which we shall not venture to speculate. Meanwhile, it is important that the Church of England should clearly understand, that in its original character, as a body of irregulars, fighting by her side, though not amenable to her tactics, the Wesleyan Society has ceased to exist; and that, in the place of it, a regular sect has been formed, devoid of definite articles of belief, and recently remodelled upon a hierarchical scheme, in imitation of the hierarchy of the Church; a sect which, whatever else it may be, or profess to be, is hostile in principle to the Church, not only on account of its character as a separatist body, but still more on account of its high pretensions as a national Church, setting itself up in rivalry against the Establishment. Notwithstanding the professions of attachment to the Church, which are still often repeated in the phraseology of its founder, while proceedings of a directly contrary tendency are adopted, abundant proofs of that hostility are extant in the later publications of the connexion; and, among others, the tone adopted, and the course pursued, in regard to Church Education, this very year—for which we refer our readers to the Narrative of the united Committees of Privileges and Education (No. 2 at the head of this Article)—are conclusive as to the question whether the Wesleyans consider themselves a body auxiliary to the Church, or a body distinct from the Church; and opposed, if not to her existence, at least to her national position, and to the extension of her influence upon the people.

To enter the lists against them, on account of the aggressive attitude which they have assumed, is no part of our purpose. We are quite willing that they should stand convicted out of their own mouths; and for this purpose it will be sufficient for us to transcribe, in conclusion, the admonition which the conference of this present year has issued for the prevention of "irregularities" in the connexion, and which, by simply substituting "the Church" for "the connexion," and John Wesley and his followers, who disturbed the order of the Church, for the disturbers of the order of the connexion now reprov'd by the conference,—becomes as suitable a homily as any which the bench of bishops could possibly have drawn up, for the correction of Wesleyan "excesses" and schisms:—

"While this conference have always been, and are, sincerely and

cordially thankful for those genuine and scriptural revivals of religion, with which God has been graciously pleased so often to visit many of our circuits, and by which he has from time to time refreshed and extended his heritage among us, they feel themselves bound in conscience, and in *fidelity to the sacred trust specially committed to THEM, as the recognized ministers and pastors* of the connexion, to declare in the strongest terms their disapprobation of the *occasion* which certain persons have taken from some recent movements, designed for the promotion of religious revivals, to encourage *a spirit of unholy dissension, strife, and disorder*. The conference fully believe, that, in very many instances, this has occurred without any evil intention, and inadvertently, or without due consideration. But it is *their deliberate judgment, that the tendency and operation of the proceedings to which reference is here made, have been to produce serious discords of opinion, feeling, and conduct among brethren, and to create that INTERNAL DISUNION, which is truly and scripturally condemned as DIVISIVE and SCHISMATICAL*. In connexion with this great evil, the conference regret to perceive, not indeed generally, but yet in too many instances, *a disposition to adopt (perhaps unawares) views and sentiments which, ON THE ALLEGED GROUND OF CONCERN FOR SPECIAL AND EXTRAORDINARY REVIVALS, have the effect of alienating in some degree the affections of our people from THE WELL-ACCREDITED, LONG-TRIED, AND OFFICIALLY RESPONSIBLE MINISTERS AND PASTORS OF OUR CHURCHES,—of lessening them in public estimation,—of diminishing their legitimate and beneficial influence,—OF SUBSTITUTING SOMETHING NEW AND IRREGULAR FOR THE ORDINARY MINISTRY AND STANDING INSTITUTIONS OF THE GOSPEL, and of leading some individuals, most injuriously to themselves, to undervalue the authority and eventual efficiency, under the promised blessing of the HOLY SPIRIT, of the stated preaching of the Word, and other appointed means of grace.*—*Minutes of the 104th Annual Conference*, pp. 151, 152.

Is it possible that the followers of John Wesley can write in this strain, without perceiving that the principles they put forth in the assertion of their own hierarchical claims, are the very principles by which the whole career of their “venerable founder” stands rebuked, and the seal of condemnation is set upon their own schismatical existence? Surely this, if any thing, is a case of “*Mutato nomine de te fabula narratur!*”

**ART. V.—1.** *The Apostolic Succession explained; a Short Treatise in which certain Theological questions of the day are calmly examined and resolved. By a PRIEST OF THE ORDER OF CHARITY.* London: Richardsons.

**2.** *The Unity of the Episcopate considered, in reply to the work of the Rev. T. W. ALLIES, M.A., entitled "The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism, upon Testimonies of Councils and Fathers of the first Six Centuries."* By EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. London: Richardsons.

**3.** *Remarks on Certain Anglican Theories of Unity.* By EDWARD HEALY THOMPSON, M.A. London: Dolman.

Our object in noticing these Roman Catholic publications is to draw attention to the present state of the discussion between Romanism and the Church of England, and to assist our readers in forming a judgment on the arguments and positions which are now put forward with much confidence by the adherents of the Papacy. The first of these little works consists chiefly of a statement of principles with regard to the See of Rome, from whence certain conclusions are drawn, intended to show that the Romish Vicars Apostolic in England possess full Episcopal powers, and that the "Anglican" prelates have no spiritual power whatever. On the "principles" laid down by this writer we must pause for a moment.

The words of our Lord "Thou art Peter," &c., are interpreted to convey "sovereignty;" because "the keys, in the language of Scripture, are its symbol and sign."

"It is, therefore, all his power which Jesus Christ confers on Peter, without any exception or limitation. He establishes him in his stead, to loose and bind; and he who said, 'All power is given to me in heaven and on earth,' intrusts to the Prince of the Apostles this same unbounded power, which must continue, until the end of ages, the strength and salvation of the Church. We say until the end of ages; for the reason for which this pontifical supremacy of St. Peter was instituted is of such a nature as essentially to require perpetual duration, and therefore its transmission to St. Peter's successors. That reason is certainly no other than the necessity of maintaining unity—unity of faith, and unity of government. But unity is equally necessary in the Church at all times; the means, therefore, appointed for its preservation must subsist for ever. Peter, therefore, always living in his suc-

cessors, is the only source of jurisdiction: from the plenitude of his power all spiritual authority emanates, as we are taught by the Fathers, sovereign pontiffs, and councils. Not to multiply quotations unnecessarily, we shall content ourselves with citing the decision of the general council of Florence. 'We define that the holy Apostolic See and Roman Pontiff hold supremacy over the whole world, and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles; that he is the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the Father and Doctor of all Christians; that on him, in the person of St. Peter, was conferred full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church, as indeed appears from the acts of œcumenical councils and the sacred canons.'"—pp. 13, 14.

This author afterwards proceeds to state that all patriarchs, metropolitans, and other governors of the Church, were established either directly or indirectly by the popes, so that the latter "possess by Divine right supreme authority over the other bishops; whence this last conclusion—that all spiritual jurisdiction *emanates from and depends on the Roman Pontiff.*"—(p. 21.) "Such," he adds, "is the Pope's supremacy of jurisdiction; such is, in the words of the great Bossuet, '*The eternal chair, from which must flow through all ages the ray of government.*'" The other Apostles had no succession in their apostolic power: their offices were extraordinary: "their commission was only temporary and personal, but none of them, except St. Peter, *could transmit it to a successor.*"—(p. 29.)

Thus, then, the bishop of Rome, inheriting "the plenitude of uncontrolled apostolic power is . . . perfectly equal in authority to the prince of the Apostles himself. His power . . . is, indeed, regulated by the canons, but is limited only by the Divine law; and *he is accountable for its administration to God alone.*"—(p. 31.) The successors of St. Peter receive from Christ the same power as St. Peter received, "but yet by means of a *lawful election* to the See of Rome." Hence the See of Rome is believed to be the centre and source of unity—a unity which can never be interrupted or perish. "Unity, *the perfection of unity*, is manifestly the sovereign idea contemplated by the Son of God, in framing a plan of government for the society of his children upon earth, and *Peter and his eternal chair, form the immutable centre of this indestructible unity.*"—(p. 34.) Hence the author makes this profession of faith. "'I believe the Church one;' one in the apostolic times, *one through all succeeding ages*, because she *never had but one supreme head*, and the word of her Divine Founder is *perpetually* fulfilled, 'There shall be one fold, and one shepherd.'"—(p. 35.)

The Roman pontiff can issue laws and decrees binding on all

and every one of the faithful, can reserve to himself the right of pronouncing judgment in important causes, &c.—(p. 38.)

We wonder, after such statements of the supreme apostolical power of the pope, to hear our author pretending that “an *unjust law*, or an unmerited censure of the pope, might be *overlooked* [or disobeyed] *secluso scandalo*.”—(p. 40.) Is not this in direct contradiction to his fundamental principle? If the successor of St. Peter has the same “*unbounded power*” as St. Peter himself; if the power of Jesus Christ was conferred by him on St. Peter, “without *any exception or limitation* ;” and if the pope is “*accountable for its administration to God alone*,” (p. 31,) how can this rebellious sheep of the pontifical flock presume to suppose that it is ever lawful to disobey the pope’s laws and censures, under pretence that they are “unjust?” This writer, therefore, breaks down as soon as ever he has stated the papal supremacy. His principle, in spite of himself, authorizes the sheep to rebel at pleasure against their shepherd! Who is to judge whether the pope’s laws are “unjust?” Is it to be the individual Christian? If so, we felicitate this “priest of the order of Charity” on so truly *Protestant* an admission: if the pope—then what becomes of the pretended right of “overlooking” the papal laws? If this writer authorizes Romanists to disobey the pope’s laws, surely he cannot deny the same right to others. He will not blame Luther, Calvin, or Knox, for exercising the right which he here claims for all the faithful.

We have referred to this little publication, not because it exhibits any particular power, nor, on the other hand, is remarkable for weakness; but merely as illustrating the views now current amongst Romanists. The marked inconsistency just alluded to, is found every where. No Romanist, however ultramontane be his theories, will face the real difficulties of his position, and boldly maintain, that obedience is, under all cases, and without exception, due to the “vicar of Christ.” He has always his “exceptions,” for his own especial benefit: he invariably reserves the right of “private judgment” for himself, though he protests against it when claimed by persons of a different communion.

But to proceed, this writer holds that all canons and councils derive their force from the sovereign pontiffs (p. 45); that he is “exempt from the control of canonical laws,” &c. (p. 49); that he is “omnipotent” in the Church; that all jurisdiction “must descend directly or indirectly from the holy see (p. 52); that “all Catholics do and must believe, that *no bishop can possibly receive jurisdiction over a diocese*, unless he be appointed over it by the pope (p. 61); that to deny, by word or deed, that all spiritual



authority and jurisdiction emanates from Rome (as the Gallicans do), *is injurious to faith, and therefore heretical . . . in itself, and in a moral point of view*" (p. 72).

On the subject of communion with Rome, the "priest" says, "*whatever discussions may reign among bishops, so long as all parties, at variance with each other, adhere to the chair of blessed Peter, none of them are excluded from the communion of the Church Universal; much less can schism affect the Roman Pontiff personally.* For since he is the centre and foundation *on which the unity of the whole Church depends, he could not be severed from this unity without being first separated from himself.* Thanks be to Christ, who so framed the constitution of his Church, as to secure her visible head *against the very possibility of falling into schism,*" (p. 102.) And in reply to those Romanists, who have imagined that they could adhere to the see of Rome, without always obeying the pope, (such as Bossuet, and the Gallicans, and our author himself;) we have our "priest" speaking thus. "In vain has a distinction been imagined between *the Apostolic See, and the Roman Pontiff,* as a justification for those who do not communicate with him, but who say vaguely that they preserve communion with the *Holy See.* Whilst the pope lives, the Holy See is nothing else but the pontiff himself, discharging the duties of his sublime station" (p. 102).

From such principles as these, the "priest" finds it very easy to prove that the "Vicars Apostolic" in England have full jurisdiction, and that the "Anglican" bishops have none whatever.—Q. E. D.

We now turn to Mr. Thompson's work on the episcopate. This writer is possessed of no inconsiderable acuteness; and he has pointed out various inconsistencies in the work of Mr. Allies. But, it is not our intention to express at present any opinion as to the merits of this controversy, further than that we think Mr. Allies is, in the main, right; although he has not always been sufficiently guarded. Our object is to produce Mr. Thompson as another witness of the views which are prevalent amongst English Romanists.

This writer, then, "admits" and "adopts" (p. 5,) "the Roman doctrine as stated by Bellarmine," that "bishops succeed not properly to the Apostles, for they have no part of the true apostolic ministry," but that "*all ordinary jurisdiction of bishops descends immediately from the Pope,*" and that "the Pope has *full and entire that power which Christ left on the earth for the good of the Church.*" (p. 1.) Mr. Thompson holds this doctrine "as that which seems to him to be implicitly held by the Church."

(p. 7.) He argues at some length that all episcopal jurisdiction is *derived* from that of the pope, (p. 62—72,) founding it on the commission of our Lord to Peter, "Feed my sheep," &c. So firmly is he convinced of this, that he holds with Bolgeni, (whose work on the Episcopate appears to be a text-book with Romanists at present,) that "the pope being deceased, there is no one in the Church of God who has universal jurisdiction over all the bishops and Christian people; . . . and, consequently, no one can give it to the successor who is to be elected; for it is an incontrovertible truth, that no one gives to another that power which he has not of himself." (p. 72.) So that on this view the papal jurisdiction, supposed to be exactly the same as that of St. Peter, is not transmitted by succession from St. Peter, or by a lawful election or appointment; but is the immediate gift of Jesus Christ—a doctrine which makes each pope a fresh *Apostle*, though without any outward mission or credentials as such. Each of these Apostles is without the power of working miracles, and without the power of writing inspired books: pretending to be commissioned by God as St. Peter was, they cannot so much as cure an ox or an ass in proof of their apostolic mission.

But to return to our author: according to him the pope is "the *ultimate source of all ordinary jurisdiction* (p. 73): the sovereign "*legislative and executive power*" resides in him (p. 135); the "union" of bishops with "Peter as their head," "constitutes their corporal *existence*" (p. 135). A council cannot be general or represent the Universal Church unless it is in union with him (p. 136). He possesses "the *inseparable attribute of infallibility*" (p. 145); and though this doctrine of papal infallibility "is not a formally ruled doctrine of the Church," it is "generally entertained by the divines of the Church" (p. 144); and he even holds, with the "Priest of the Order of Charity," that the Gallican doctrines, if held at the present day, would be under certain circumstances of full knowledge, "*heretical*" (p. 204).

Mr. Thompson is *strong* in his maintenance of the common Roman doctrine, which asserts the inviolable unity of the Church at all times. He grows quite eloquent on this point. "The Roman or Catholic doctrine is," he says, "that the Church is one—*indivisibly* one; that its unity is such that it not only *ought not* to be broken, but that it *cannot* be broken. . . . To hold that *the unity of the Church can be broken, or suspended, is to hold a heresy: it is to deny one of the articles of the Christian faith*" (p. 183). Mr. Thompson speaks "*advisedly*" on this point. He does not speak without book. And he is quite right in

saying that such is the doctrine universally held by Roman Catholic divines at the present day. It is the very cornerstone on which all their controversial writings depend. It is the *vital* point in their system of argument.

In fact, this view appears to have led to this unfortunate gentleman's secession from the communion of the English Church. His first difficulties, as he tells us in his "Remarks on certain Anglican Theories of Unity" (p. 2), arose from his finding it impossible "to reconcile the fact of a *divided* Church, as Anglicans accounted it, with the idea of corporate *oneness* which the Jewish dispensation presented," and which he therefore inferred to be essential in the Christian dispensation. And the whole of the tract is occupied in attempts to involve in contradictions and absurdities of every kind, the notion of a Catholic Church, in which communion is suspended between different churches. He begins by arguing, that the question of the unity of the Church is one on which *no difference of opinion is allowable*; and, consequently, that either those who hold the "Anglican," or those who hold the Romish view, must be heretics; but the "Anglican," being unable to maintain itself, the Romish must be the true one, &c.

He argues that the view, which regards the Greek, the English, and the Latin Church, as parts of the Universal Church, assumes that the Catholic Church consists of an aggregation of separate independent bodies holding no visible communion, *and not bound to do so* (p. 12); that on this principle, every particular episcopal see may separate from all the rest (p. 14. 22); no particular Church can be guilty of the sin of schism (p. 16); that on these principles a positively schismatical body may be in communion with a union of Churches without involving the latter in the guilt of schism (p. 18). In short, absurdities without end are fastened on the theory which the author attributes to "Anglicans;" and it may be readily conceded, that if this author is entitled to give his own representations of the positions of "Anglicans," he can make them ridiculous enough. According to him, those who admit the possibility of two or more communions existing in the Catholic Church, must necessarily maintain the right of unlimited division. He labours throughout to prove that any such theory entirely subverts the necessity for visible communion, and leads to universal anarchy. And with this, he contrasts the Romish idea of "*one visible organized body, holding the faith entire and unchanged*" (p. 57), which, "*whatever external divisions take place, and how many soever they be,*" "*always continues to be the Church, remaining on its foundation unmoved and unshaken, while the rest of the parts, be they*

many or be they few, have . . . fallen into schism " (p. 65). "According to the Roman or Catholic doctrine, the *external or visible oneness of the Church is incapable of being destroyed*. It is capable of being reduced to any degree short of extinction; but there is one only point beyond which such reduction cannot proceed; it is the *rock of Peter*; all other portions may fail—that cannot" (p. 69).

Such are the doctrines of this writer on the subject of an external visible unity of communion in the Church. He maintains, in the boldest manner, that this external unity is of the essence of the Church in such a sense that it *cannot* be broken. If division takes place, one party or other is always in *schism*; and it is "heretical," according to him, to deny this.

After all this attack on the very notion of a divided Church, it is curious enough to find Mr. Thompson distinctly admitting that very doctrine himself. He informs us (*Unity of Episc.* p. 185) that he deems it "unnecessary to enter" on a subject which he alludes to; namely, that "*actual intercommunion between Churches may, through external causes, be suspended; a Church may be in a state of material, as distinguished from formal schism.*" He informs us, that, in such cases, *unity is not suspended*. This is rather tender ground, and Mr. Thompson does wisely to avoid it. Unity, it here comes out, is sometimes consistent with "the suspension of actual intercommunion between Churches." Mr. Thompson even goes beyond this:—"The Catholic allows that (*under circumstances*) a total suspension of communion may last for many years, without either side incurring the sin of *formal* heresy or schism<sup>1</sup>." Mr. Thompson goes on to contend, that, in such case, there will be probably *material* schism on one side or the other; but this does not, on his own statement, interfere with Catholic *unity*. So that, in fine, this author is obliged at length to admit (though in his own terms) the very theory which, in a misrepresented and exaggerated form, he has been assailing.

Strange and deplorable as such inconsistencies are, they are not the only inconsistencies of this sadly deceived, but able and conscientious writer. No one, as we have seen, can be more earnest in the maintenance of the ultramontane theories of the papal infallibility and absolute power than Mr. Thompson. He goes so far as to affix the imputation of "heresy" to the Gallican doctrines. It was, therefore, with no small surprise that we came to the following passage in his "*Unity of the Episcopate*," which is most distinctly "Gallican," and therefore "heretical,"

<sup>1</sup> Anglican Theories, p. 76.

on his own showing:—"No *Catholic*," he says, "supposes that the pope possesses an *absolute* despotic authority: such authority has no place in Christ's Church. Many ere now have *appealed against a papal decision*, and claimed a re-hearing of their cause; nay, they have *rebuked and resisted the pope*, not as denying his supremacy, but as protesting *against a particular exercise of it*" (p. 127). Mr. Thompson has not, we are happy to see, entirely left his "Anglicanism" behind him. He is an excellent "Gallican," to say the least. He admits the supremacy, but claims the right of exercising his private judgment against its "particular exercise!" This is pure and undiluted Gallicanism; and we are therefore happy to claim this writer as an involuntary witness against his own principles, and against the principles of Romanism, in general, at this day. What did the Gallicans, or even the Jansenists, claim more than the right of "appeal," and of "resistance" to the pope? What is there that the popes themselves have more regularly condemned than "appeals" from their decrees, and "resistance" to their regulations?

We do not say this with any feeling of disrespect for Mr. Thompson's abilities, which are considerable; or with the slightest doubt of his sincerity. He is evidently a sincere and earnest supporter of a system which he believes to be the only true one. But is it not a very striking and significant fact, that those who forsake the Church of England because, in their opinion, it cannot present a theory of the Church which is perfectly *consistent*, and which meets their notions of what a Divine institution ought to be, should themselves at once fall into such utter and helpless self-contradiction? To do these well-meaning persons justice, it is not from any defect in their own powers of reasoning that they have thus failed. It is because they have been *deeply deceived by a false system of reasoning*—a system absolutely false, and most erroneous—that they have exhibited such a deplorable spectacle. The fault is inherent in the theological system they have embraced.

It is absolutely necessary for the adherents of the papacy—even for those who exaggerate its powers the most—to place *some* limit to its powers, and to provide, in certain cases, for resistance to its injunctions. The notion of implicit obedience to the papacy in all cases, although it is declared to be invested with THE POWER OF JESUS CHRIST HIMSELF, is one that Romanists cannot, in spite of all their theories, receive. They have never acted on it. The Irish Roman Catholic priesthood would refuse obedience to the pope to-morrow, if he were to give the sovereign of England the power of nominating their bishops, summoning

their synods, restricting their regulations, and paying their clergy. They *did* refuse to submit to the pope in allowing a veto to the English sovereigns. Supposing the pope to enact a law, by which all the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland were at once divested of their jurisdiction, and replaced by "vicars apostolic," would they obey him? Suppose him even to reserve to himself all appointment to parishes, or to demand, now and then, a year's income of their benefices, or to suppress all the religious orders, would they obey? We know not how this might be: we are of opinion that they would claim the right of "resistance;" but we think that the common sense of every Romanist, however ultra and extravagant may be his theories on the papacy, would, after all, suggest to him certain possible cases in which he would be justified, nay *bound*, to disobey the pope. And the moment this is admitted, the absolute power of the pope is at an end, and ultramontaniam along with it.

But there is another curious doctrine in Mr. Thompson's theory of the Church, which is by no means peculiar to this writer. When we have hitherto had to do with Romish controversialists, we have always found the *Catholicity*, or *universality* of the Church, a great point in their argument. Hence, in all books of Romish controversy, it is argued, that the Church of Rome, being more widely extended and more numerous than any other Christian communion, has the best claim to be considered the Catholic Church of Christ: but the new school of theology, arising in the Romish communion under the auspices of the recent separatists from the Church of England, adopts a different theory on this subject. Mr. Thompson observes on Mr. Allies, that his "idea of Catholicity is as defective as his idea of unity. By the Church being Catholic, he means simply *that it has actual possession in all parts of the world*. He does not seem to perceive that the Church is *therefore Catholic*, because, wherever it extends, it preserves its identity; it has the property of universal diffusiveness, and is the Church not of this or that locality, nor of this or that nation, but of the universe." (p. 192.) And shortly after, he remarks:—

"The Church is both one and Catholic, and cannot cease to be either. It may suffer external diminution or reduction, but itself will remain an integral and perfect whole. That portions should detach themselves on this side and on that—that large communities should maintain a separate existence—that offences shall come, and schism, and fallings away from the body, is no more than was predicted, and *taken place in every age from the beginning. The chosen people as one among thousands. Of the twelve tribes, ten revolted; of*



*the remaining two, only a remnant believed.* In the days of Athanasius, the world seemed to be not Catholic, but Arian. *Even were the Catholic Church, therefore, the least communion in the world, were Catholics as few in number as were the Jews in proportion to the other nations of the earth, the terms of the creed would be as true as they ever were; the Church would still be both one and Catholic.*—p. 194.

We could really almost imagine we were reading an extract from Luther or Calvin, in perusing these eminently *Protestant* sentiments. What becomes of the note of "Catholicity" after this, as it is treated in all Romish books of controversy? The "true Catholic Church," on these principles, might be the Church in communion with the See of Canterbury; for, to say the least, she is "potentially" Catholic in extent. Is this, then, the doctrine of Romanists? Is this the position of Dr. Wiseman, and of all the English Romanists, who are so continually quoting the arguments of Optatus and Augustine against the Donatists, that they could not be the Catholic Church, because *they did not communicate with all nations*? If the Catholic Church may be "the least of all communions," what is the value of St. Augustine's argument against the Donatists? Has "development" already, in the course of a year or two, led its disciples to reject the chief grounds on which they joined the Roman communion, and enabled them thus to throw aside the authority of the fathers?

And, in fine, may we not here submit to Mr. Thompson's consideration, that there is a *positive difference of opinion amongst Romanists on this article of the Creed*? They believe the Church to be "Catholic;" but they are at variance when they come to explain the meaning of "Catholicity." The word Catholic, says Dr. Milner, has "ever been employed" to "discriminate the *great body* of Christians under their legitimate pastors, from those comparatively *small bodies* of Christians, who, in certain places, and at certain times, have been separated from it." "The true Church is Catholic in these several respects . . . It consists of the *most numerous* body of Christians." (End of Cont. Lett. xxvi.) "The Roman Church," says Perrone, "is *more numerous* than all sects, taken together," and, therefore, has the note of Catholicity (De Ecclesia, part 7, chap. 2). "The Catholic," says Dr. Baines, "is the only universal religion . . . It is comparatively *universal as to numbers, being infinitely more numerous than any other sect or denomination of Christians*, and, perhaps, than all other sects and denominations put together." (Sermon on Faith, &c.)

On the other hand, we have Mr. Thompson asserting, "were.

Catholics *as few in number* as were the Jews, in proportion to the other nations of the earth, *the terms of the Creed would be as true as they ever were.*" Cardinal Bellarmine also observes, "that the Church is Catholic because it is made known to all nations, and brings forth fruit in all. But note," he says, "that it is not necessary that this should take place simultaneously, so that there must necessarily be at one time believers in all provinces. It is enough if it be so *successively*. Whence it follows, that if *one province alone retained the true faith, it would still be truly and properly called the Catholic Church, &c.*"

The "Dublin Review" adopts these sentiments on the subject of Catholicity. In reply to Mr. Allies' argument, that if the Church of Rome has preserved the note of *unity*, she has lost that of *Catholicity*, the Reviewer says :

"Surely, then, on the day of Pentecost she had it not ! How could a Church, confined in one city, in one obscure province of the Roman empire, be Catholic ? As Mr. Thompson observes, 'the Church is, therefore, Catholic, because wherever it extends it preserves its identity ; it has the property of universal diffusiveness, and is the Church, not of this or that locality, nor of this or that nation, but of the universe,' because it is 'the Church of all nations, and people, and languages ; because it is, at all times, and in all places, *potentially Catholic.*'"

Hear Mr. Renouf on this head :—

"To those who think that the question is affected by *numbers*, I would offer the consideration of a possible case. The population of China is supposed to exceed three hundred and eighty millions ; and, consequently, to out-number all the existing Christian communions put together. If the Emperor of China became a Christian, and, like the first Christian Sovereign of Russia, made the profession of Christianity obligatory upon his subjects, we should have more Christians in China than in all the remainder of the world. How is it, I ask, an inconceivable or extravagant hypothesis, that a future emperor, and a handful of obsequious bishops, should start a heresy or schism in which their ignorant, but obedient, population should be involved ? And if so, are they still to be considered as belonging to the Christian Church, *for the paltry reason*, that the exclusion of three hundred millions would ruin the Catholicity of the Church ?"—*Dublin Review*, No. xliv. p. 311.

<sup>2</sup> "Tertio ex Driedone Lib. iv. c. 2, part. 2, de Eccles. dogmat. nota, non requiri, ut hoc fiat simul, ita ut uno tempore in omnibus provinciis necessario esse oporteat aliquos fideles. Satis enim est, si fiat successivè. Ex quo id sequitur, quodsi sola una provincia retineret veram fidem, adhuc verè et propriè diceretur Ecclesia Catholica, dummodo clarè ostenderetur, eam esse unam et eandem cum illa quæ fuit aliquo tempore, vel diversis in toto mundo, quemadmodum nunc quælibet Dioecesis dicitur Catholica, quia est continuata cum aliis, quæ faciunt unam Ecclesiam Catholicam."—Bell. De Eccl. not. lib. iv. c. vii.

Here, then, we have a marked difference of interpretation amongst Romanists, in reference to this article of the Creed. According to one interpretation, the Church is Catholic, *because* it is the most numerous and widely-extended of all Christian denominations. According to another interpretation, it is still Catholic, though it may be the *least* of all Christian denominations, and may exist only in a single province. Mr. Thompson forsook the Church of England, because there was a difference of view between the Roman Church and the English on the “unity” of the Church. Why, then, does he unite with the Roman Church, in which as marked a difference exists on the subject of the “Catholicity” of the Church? Are not differences as important on the one article of the Creed, as on the other?

It is not in any spirit of controversy that we point out these inconsistencies in Romanism. They are facts which ought not to be concealed by any lover of truth. We can readily imagine that Romanists may feel it a matter of duty never to peruse any works published against their religion; but it must be of importance and interest to them to understand the principles of their own writers, and to adopt a *consistent* line of argument in support of their cause. Consistency is, in their opinion, the peculiar attribute of their own system. All others are inconsistent and self-destructive, according to them.

We feel, however, that the immediate answer to such instances of inconsistency, as we have pointed out, will be, that the Roman Catholic Church is not *responsible* for the writings of its particular members. Be it so. Still it will not be without its use to have remarked, even cursorily, on the positions now assumed by the new school which is forming amongst them—positions which, certainly, are not calculated to induce any *despair* for the cause of truth.

But these remarks have been intended chiefly for the purpose of contrasting the Romish theories of the unity of the Church, with the actual history of the Western Church during one of the most eventful periods of the middle ages. It will be our effort to carry the reader briefly with us through the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in which the Roman Catholic Church was placed in a position which throws a strong light on many questions and principles now in debate between Romanists and others. We do not profess to have made any profound researches into the history of the age. We have consulted no manuscripts, and transcribed no original documents. We merely avail ourselves of the information which is supplied by such Roman Catholic writers as, Father Raynaldus, the Abbé Fleury, Dr. Döllinger, and other usual authorities. Our narrative will

be wholly drawn from Roman Catholic sources; and its leading facts, which are all that we mean to argue from, are perfectly undeniable and notorious.

The power which the See of Rome had gradually acquired in the course of ages, was never greater, perhaps, than in the fourteenth century. In the latter part of that century they were in possession of the right of appointing archbishops, bishops, and abbots, throughout all the countries of Europe. They even disposed at pleasure, of all benefices whatever. On one occasion, Pope Clement VII. gave the King of France, as a matter of favour, the next presentation to four bishoprics, and seven hundred and fifty livings! The popes had the power of imposing taxes on the ecclesiastical property whenever they judged it advisable, and this right was continually exercised. Vast sums flowed into their coffers from the sale of indulgences, and of presentations to livings. They had also for ages exercised the right of deposing sovereigns from their dominions, and exempting their subjects from the oaths of allegiance they had taken. They were recognized by the whole of the Roman communion as the "vicars of Christ,"—the "successors of St. Peter,"—possessed of the plenitude of apostolic power. Communion with them was believed necessary to salvation; and these principles, and the powers which the papacy exercised in consequence, were of old standing. They had been gradually "developed" in the course of ages, and by the natural course of events. Step after step, they had gained supreme power over the Church, and over temporal sovereigns. This power followed, as a necessary result, from the belief of the appointment of the pope by Jesus Christ as head of the Universal Church: it was a strict and legitimate "development" of this one "idea."

The pope being admitted to be the source of all jurisdiction, and the chief pastor under Christ, was not bound by any laws or canons made by the Church. He could reverse all laws, and dispense with all regulations. A series of popes taught these principles, and acted on them. Resistance was indeed sometimes made, but the papacy always triumphed in the end by its perseverance.

Thus, then, in the fourteenth century, the popes had attained absolute power. They had wrested the whole patronage of benefices from the laity, in order to prevent the sale of benefices: they had exempted themselves from all obligations except those imposed by their own will and pleasure: they held powers, which have since, to a great extent, been *lost*.

One of the most remarkable proofs which the pontiffs afforded of their power of *dispensing with the canons of the Church* was

afforded by their removal from the seat of their bishopric—at Rome, and fixing their residence in France,—a foreign country. The system of *non-residence*, from which so many evils have resulted to the Church, was thus regularly practised and sanctioned by the popes themselves. From the election of Clement V. in 1305, they abandoned the management of the Roman See and of their territories in Italy to the care of their officials, and continued for seventy years, *i. e.* until the year 1376, to reside at Avignon, in France. This prolonged absence of the Roman pontiffs from the city of Rome, was, in many ways, very repugnant to the wishes of the Roman clergy and people; and many ineffectual efforts were made by them to induce the pontiffs to return to the proper sphere of their duties. Those prelates, however, who were natives of France, were unwilling to transfer their residence from the country of their birth, and the sovereigns of France were anxious to continue a system which gave to them a predominant influence in the councils of the sovereign pontiff, and secured the appointment of French subjects to the papacy.

At length, however, the time arrived, when France, humbled and exhausted by the victories of Edward III. of England, offered no opposition to the departure of the Roman pontiff from its territories.

Towards the end of August, 1376, ambassadors arrived at Avignon from the Romans, with a commission authorizing them to supplicate Pope Gregory XI. to transfer his court to Rome, and to reside there with his cardinals. The Romans, they assured him, were desirous of his residence at Rome, because he was the Roman pontiff, and every one knew him to be such; and they added a significant intimation, not very easily reconcilable with Roman Catholic principles, that if his holiness did not act on this very bold suggestion, the Romans would provide themselves with a pope who would live at Rome. This threat was not likely to evaporate in mere words, for the Romans had actually applied to the abbot of the great Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino to become the anti-pope; and this venerable ecclesiastic was perfectly willing to accept the proffered post! Under these circumstances, the cardinal legate at Rome very discreetly pressed on Gregory XI. the expediency of a prompt compliance with the request of the Roman people, in order to avoid the scandals which might arise; and the holy father, struck by his representations, instead of unsheathing the sword of “Peter” for the punishment of his schismatically-disposed people, deemed it most prudent to acquiesce, and made haste to leave Avignon, *en route* for Rome, recommending to his cardinals

to follow his suite without a moment's loss of time. The King of France, in whom the papal residence at Avignon was highly esteemed, beheld his departure with undisguised regret; but his embassy, the Duke of Anjou, who went to Avignon with the object of dissuading the pope from this enterprise, failed in producing any effect by the moving picture which he drew of the dangers and unpleasantness of a sojourn in Italy; and the pontiff started with the majority of his cardinals on the road to Marseille, Genoa, and Rome.

We pass over the honours, which the venerable father experienced on his journey of three months' duration, and at his arrival at the patriarchal See of Rome: we must take the reader to a different scene.—the death-bed of Pope Gregory. Scarcely had the pontiff time to become acquainted with the principal features of his new abode, when he was seized with illness, which assumed a character of extreme severity. On the 19th March, 1378, finding himself in danger, he published a bull, to the following effect:—"If our death happens before the first day of September next, (he intended, if he lived, to *return* to Avignon,) the cardinals who shall be at Rome, shall, without inviting or awaiting those who are absent, choose such place as they wish, either within or without the city, for the election of our successor; and they may lengthen or abridge the time allowed to the absent cardinals to arrive before entering the conclave. They may, even without entering them, elect a pope who may be elected by the majority, even if the minority should offer opposition . . . . We charge their consciences to elect a worthy pope, and as soon as possible<sup>3</sup>."

The pontiff breathed his last in the course of a few days, and the sixteen cardinals who were at Rome, acting on the powers there given them, proceeded to take the usual steps for entering the conclave at the Vatican, where they received an application from the citizens of Rome, conceived in the following terms:—

"The length and absence of the popes has brought decay on Rome and Italy in general. The churches at Rome, those from which the cardinals derive their titles, and the palaces, have fallen into ruin, to the great scandal of the pilgrims who come hither through devotion from all parts of Christendom. There is no better remedy for these evils but the residence of the pope and cardinals in the place where God himself has established the holy See, and where all the popes resided till Clement V." After some other similar remarks, they concluded by entreating that an *Italian* might be elected pope.

<sup>3</sup> Raynald. Ann. 1378.



To this application a reply, conceived in general terms, was made; and the cardinals entered the conclave in the midst of very considerable popular excitement and tumult. Whether their liberty of choice, however, was in reality infringed on, is a disputed question, which has never been settled, and on which the validity of the election turned; but after various intrigues, which we need not detail, the choice of the majority fell on Bartholomew de Prignano, Archbishop of Bari, who assumed the title of URBAN VI., and was regularly enthronized and crowned by the cardinals, who also announced to the cardinals who had remained at Avignon, that their election of Pope Urban had been free and unanimous. The election was, in fact, expressly acknowledged and recognized by all the cardinals as legitimate<sup>4</sup>.

And thus, apparently, would the matter have remained, had not Urban VI., by the extreme severity of his reproofs, and the extremity of his zeal to put an end to the non-residence of the cardinals, given deep offence to that influential body. The result of his conduct was, that in one month after his appointment, the cardinals, in deep discontent, retired from Rome to Anagni in Campania, where they announced that the election of Urban was null, having been made under compulsion, and that they had only recovered their liberty when they had left Rome. The first result of their discontent appeared on the month of August, when a solemn mass having been celebrated in the Church of Anagni by the titular Patriarch of Constantinople, the cardinals caused their formal declaration, addressed to "all the faithful," to be published against Pope Urban; in which, having referred to the tumult, which took place while they were in conclave, they added that they had, in order to avoid the violence which menaced them, elected the Archbishop of Bari, who ought not to have accepted the offer, knowing the election to be legally null; that they had frequently remonstrated with him in vain; but," they continued, "being no longer able *conscientiously* to suffer this scandal, we denounce this anathematized usurper as an intruder into the pontificate; and we exhort you not to obey or adhere to him in any manner, since we have already exhorted him by other letters, and do by these presents, to leave the Holy See, the ensigns of the pontificate, and the administration of the Church of Rome in temporals and spirituals, and to make satisfaction to God and to the Church by a true penance: otherwise, we shall seek for all aid Divine and human against him, and will employ all other canonical remedies."

<sup>4</sup> Raynald. Annal. A.D. 1378. It seems from the facts stated alike by Raynald, Fleury, and Döllinger, that Urban was really and legitimately elected Bishop of Rome.

This formidable excommunication was signed by thirteen cardinals, out of the ~~seventeen~~<sup>thirteen</sup> then in Italy; but their party was speedily joined by the remainder; and the college of cardinals, in September, elected at Fondi, in Campania, Robert of Geneva, one of their number, as pope, who assumed the name of CLEMENT VII.

At this moment, the whole college of the cardinals espoused the cause of Clement, and Pope Urban was obliged to create a new body of cardinals, to the number of twenty-six.

The Latin Church being thus provided with two supreme heads, a hot canvass took place by the contending popes to obtain or to secure the adherence of the different nations of Europe. Urban struggled to maintain the position he had gained, and launched anathemas and bulls of deposal against all who favoured Clement's cause<sup>5</sup>. Clement laboured to establish his own claims, and to withdraw the faithful from all communion with his opponent or with his supporters. By far the larger part of the Western Church continued to acknowledge Urban as the true "vicar of Christ;" but France, Spain, Austria, Naples, Savoy, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus, espoused the cause of Clement as the legitimate pontiff<sup>6</sup>.

France was the first to acknowledge the lawfulness of his election. Charles V. convoked assemblies of bishops, clergy, and nobles; and having laid before them the circumstances of the case, and exacted an oath from them to decide according to justice, they concurred in approving the conduct of the cardinals, and in recommending the king to acknowledge Clement as pope.

Spain, at first, was neutral, and did not recognize either of the anti-popes. Henry, King of Castile, on learning the division which had taken place, and seeing the different opinions of the most learned men, determined to remain neutral, until more fully informed on the case; but, dying shortly afterwards, his son, John, King of Castile, sent ambassadors to Rome and Avignon to the rival popes, to acquire information as to their respective elections; and in 1381, after the respective pontiffs, by their legates, had pleaded their cause before a *Royal Commission*, the

<sup>5</sup> The excommunication against the adherents of Clement was conceived in these terms, "Qui vero contra præmissa vel aliquid præmissorum facerent, seu qui præfatum Robertum, qui se Clementem Papam nominat, scienter Papam nominarent, vel ipsum pro Papa tenerent, crederent, vel prædicarent, si personæ singulares, excommunicationis, si vero communitas vel universitas essent, interdicti sententias incurrerent eo ipso." Raynald. Annal. ann. 1378. c. cviii.

<sup>6</sup> Raynaldus observes here, "*Discissum se trifariam, ingemuit Christianus orbis: pars quidem maxima Urbano Pontifici conjuncta hæsit: pars ad Robertum Antipapam deficit; pars neutri studere professus est.*" Annal. ann. 1379. no. 1.

king published his declaration in favour of Pope Clement VII, and rejecting Urban VI. as an intruder.

There is something peculiarly instructive in this examination of the *papal elections by temporal sovereigns, and their parliaments or commissioners*. It would be difficult to see, why, if temporal princes may examine the elections of those who assume to be heads of the Church and vicars of Jesus Christ, they may not examine all cases of disputed elections in sees. In 1387, the Kings of Aragon and of Navarre followed the example of France and Castile, and acknowledged Clement as pope.

We now proceed to show the effects and consequences of this schism. We have no hesitation in calling it by this name, although we admit, with the whole body of Romish authors, that neither party was cut off from the Catholic Church. We must first look to the proceedings of Pope Urban and his party. Soon after the election of Pope Clement, Urban published a bull; in which, having referred to the schism of Robert of Geneva and the other cardinals, and their election of Robert as anti-pope, and having mentioned a number of prelates as their accomplices, amongst whom was James, Patriarch of Constantinople, he included them all in one sentence of condemnation, declaring them excommunicated, as guilty of heresy, schism, treason, and apostasy. He declared them deprived of the cardinalate, and of all dignities temporal and spiritual, with all other clauses of the most rigorous censures according to the style of those times.

Joanna, Queen of Naples, having recognized Clement as the true pope, and commanded her subjects to acknowledge him as such, Urban published a bull, containing an order to preach a crusade against Clement and his adherents in the kingdom of Naples, with the same indulgences as for visiting the Holy Land. Nor did Urban content himself with this step, which seems not to have had much effect. He next proceeded against the Queen Joanna, and pronounced a sentence against her, by which he declared her to be guilty of schism, heresy, and treason, for conspiring against him: in punishment of which he *deposed* her; deprived her of all the dignities, honours, kingdoms, lands, and fiefs, which she held from the Church, the empire, or other lords; declaring all her goods confiscated, and all her vassals absolved from their oaths of allegiance; forbidding all persons to obey her, under pain of excommunication against persons, and interdict against communities. He also published a sentence of excommunication and deposal against the Archbishop of Naples, who had recognized Pope Clement; and he appointed another prelate to the See of Naples.

These sentences, however, would have been ineffectual, had not the pope applied to the *temporal* power to carry them into execution. He accordingly sent an embassy to the King of Hungary, offering the kingdom of Sicily and Naples to Charles, Duke of Durazzo, a near relative of the king, on condition of his marching an army into Naples, and expelling the Queen. This tempting bait was accepted, and Charles was sent into Italy with a sufficient force; the pope supplying him with a considerable subsidy, which was raised by *the sale of a large portion of the domains and rights of the churches and monasteries of Rome*. For the same object, the pontiff sold *the gold and silver chalices, images of the saints, and other precious ornaments of the churches*, or melted them down. A commission of the pope exists, directed to two cardinals, authorizing them to alienate temporarily or in perpetuity *the property of the churches*, without regard to the prelates or incumbents of benefices, until the sum judged necessary by the commissioners should be raised.

The alienation of Church property was then, it seems, practised without scruple by the pontiffs themselves in those ages; nor does it seem that the expulsion of a sovereign prince from her dominions was an object which, in itself, was more legitimate, than the mere enrichment of the pontiff or of his adherents would have been. If Henry VIII. is to be censured for his application of monastic property and valuables to the endowment of new bishoprics or the enrichment of his nobles, he was, at least, only treading in the steps of the pontiffs themselves.

Charles was received at Rome by Pope Urban VI. with much honour, and the pope conferred on him, by a bull, the investiture of the kingdom of Naples. The new king, on his part, addressed a letter to the pope, in which he testified his gratitude, and agreed to certain conditions, one of which was a promise to preserve to Francis Prignano, *the pope's nephew*, the Principality of Capua, Duchy of Amalfi, and other territories, which the pope had reserved for him out of the kingdom of Naples. This young man was altogether without merit; and Charles reluctantly resigned so large a part of his kingdom, but he could not refuse the pope, from whom alone he was to derive his title to the kingdom of Naples.

Facts like these sufficiently show the consequences of admitting the temporal power claimed by the popes from the time of Gregory VII. It is not very easy to convince the mind that it was the intention of Jesus Christ to establish a power in the Church which should enable its heads to raise their own immediate relations to the rank of sovereign princes, and should authorize them to dismember monarchies, and assign their portions to whomso-

ever they pleased. Yet, if communion with the See of Rome be essential to salvation, it follows that the pope *must* have absolute power over all kings; because he need only enforce his decrees by excommunication, and every one *must be bound to obey them*.

On the approach of Charles, the people of Naples revolted in his favour; the queen was taken prisoner; several cardinals, bishops, and abbots of the party of Pope Clement were also seized, and thrown into prison; where they lived in poverty and misery, having lost their benefices and other possessions. Several of these unhappy victims died in confinement, amongst whom was Cardinal de Itro, whom the Clementine party regarded as a martyr.

Shortly afterwards, the papal nominee to the kingdom of Naples caused the unhappy Queen Joanna to be put to death in prison; and we do not find that the pope addressed to him any remonstrance on the subject. Queen Elizabeth is regarded as a monster, for her punishment of Mary, Queen of Scots; but here was a case which was in every respect worse, perpetrated by an obedient son of the papacy. Instead of expressing any horror at this act, Pope Urban VI. went to Naples, where he was received by the new king and queen with great respect, and where he employed himself in issuing bulls of excommunication, and proclaiming a crusade against the Duke of Anjou, who was the *Clementine* candidate for the kingdom of Naples.

The pope's nephew, Francis Prignano, who resided with him, carried off by force from the nunnery of St. Saviour a young lady of noble birth, a professed nun of the order of St. Clare, whom he retained at his residence for several days. The scandalous and immoral conduct of this man was viewed with the utmost indulgence by the pope, who always excused him on the plea of *youth*, though Prignano was forty years of age. This crime, however, caused so great a disturbance in Naples, that the king cited Prignano before him, and, on his non-appearance for trial, condemned him to lose his head. The pope, however, interfered, and disputed the right of the king to condemn one of the nobles in his presence; and the matter was ultimately so arranged, by the interference of "his Holiness" Pope Urban, that Prignano escaped with impunity, and even obtained in marriage a relative of the king with a large portion.

We now turn to the proceedings of Urban and his party in other parts of Europe.

Having learnt the declaration of the king of Castile in favour of Pope Clement, Urban published a bull against this sovereign, in which he described him as "John Henriquez, a child of iniquity, calling himself king of Castile and Leon;" and after com-

plaining that this prince had fraudulently assumed an independence or neutrality, which was a species of heresy, and had persisted in it for a time, usurping the papal revenues and rights, and causing the cathedrals, monasteries, and other benefices to be occupied by schismatics, he had, at length, assembled various prelates of his kingdom, and had declared openly for the antipope. "Wherefore," continues Pope Urban, (on the non-appearance of the king at the papal citation,) "we have pronounced against him our sentence, by which we have deprived and deposed him from all dignity, honour, and his right to the kingdom of Castile and Leon, and from all his fiefs and other possessions, which we have *confiscated*. We have declared him infamous, and liable to be seized by all faithful Christians, *and sent to us without delay*; or if he cannot be so sent with safety, that he be committed to strict confinement, until we shall otherwise direct. We forbid all the faithful, of whatever condition or dignity they may be, to receive the said John in their towns, castles, &c.; or to carry corn, wine, or other provisions, or money, to him and his followers, under penalty of excommunication for individuals, and interdict for places. Under the same penalties we forbid any obedience, or duty, or service to be paid to him, *declaring absolved from their oaths all those who have taken them to him*. We will that those who undertake the crusade for the purpose of making war on him, and exterminating him, enjoy the same indulgence and privileges as those who take the cross for the Holy Land."

The King of Castile, notwithstanding this formidable sentence, remained undisturbed in the possession of his dominions, as it happened that there was no one to carry the papal sentence into effect. John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, was about to do so, and had received full authority from Pope Urban for the purpose; but he was prevented from invading Spain by the affairs of England, which required his presence. He assumed, however, the title of King of Castile.

Another unlucky attempt was made to preach a crusade against *France*. Henry Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, received from Urban the appointment of Apostolic Nuncio, with great powers; and for the support of the crusade thus levied against France, the pope ordered a tenth of their revenues to be paid by all the churches of England. The Nuncio, however, after disembarking his troops, led them against the Flemings instead of against the king of France; but he was defeated, and compelled to retreat to his own diocese, leaving the cause of Pope Clement in undisturbed possession.

We must now turn to the proceedings of the opposite party—that of Pope Clement.



As soon as Clement had been elected, he despatched legates and nuncios to all the courts of Christendom, to lay before them his title to the papacy. These ambassadors were, in many cases, not received by those to whom they were sent, though they were backed by the king of France. Pope Urban having sent the bishop of Cordova on an embassy to the king of Arragon, he was taken on his voyage by some adherents of Clement, and sent to Fondi, where "the Antichrist" (as Urban styled him) resided, and where he was thrown into prison. Clement, having retired to France, sent to his party in Italy all the troops and money that he could collect. He also proceeded to publish bulls of excommunication and deposal against Urban and his party.

From this moment the whole Latin Church was involved in schism. Numbers of prelates, priests, and other clergy of the obedience of Urban, travelling by sea or land, were taken by the adherents of Clement, maltreated, drowned, burnt, or put to death in some other way. Towns, castles, and villages, were taken and destroyed in Naples and the papal states; churches and monasteries were ruined, or their property sold, without speaking of murder, pillage, and other crimes.

The adherents of Clement were treated in the same way by the Urbanists. They were persecuted so cruelly in person and property, that they were obliged to seek support from Clement. Numbers of them were reduced to poverty; others, though convinced of the justice of Clement's cause, acknowledged Urban, in order to save their properties.

We now return for a moment to the condition of Naples. Shortly after the conquest of the country by Charles, duke of Durazzo, and the murder of the queen, this prince and Pope Urban began to dispute over their spoils; and the result was, that the quarrel proceeded to such a length, that the pope excommunicated and deposed the new king, who had ventured to plead the right of a conqueror as authorizing him to govern his dominions without continual interference from the pope. There was, however, no one to execute the papal bull of deposition, and therefore Charles remained in the possession of his dominions; but on the death of this prince, in 1386, the party of Pope Clement became predominant at Naples; and Louis, the representative of Queen Joanna, ascended the throne. Pope Clement, on this occasion, showed as little regard for Church property as his opponent Urban; for he gave permission to his partisans to *sell the Church plate* in order to pay their soldiers.

The difficulty of deciding who was the legitimate occupant of the pontificate at this time was increased by the fact, that each

party could refer to persons of extraordinary sanctity as on their side. Pope Urban's cause was warmly supported by the famous saint, Catherine of Sienna, who was canonized in the following century, and whose visions and miracles have always rendered her an object of profound adoration in the Roman Church. This extraordinary virgin, according to her own account, had been solemnly married to our Saviour, in presence of the Virgin Mary; and she affirmed that the wedding-ring remained always invisibly on her finger. She had sucked the blood from the wound in his side, had received his heart in exchange for her own, and she bore invisibly on her body the marks of his wounds. Such a person was undoubtedly possessed of the highest authority amongst the people, and Pope Urban was so fortunate as to be enabled to profit by it. He sent for her to Rome, and by his desire she delivered an exhortation to the cardinals, exciting them to constancy in support of the pope. Shortly afterwards, he proposed to send her to Queen Joanna of Naples, who had adopted the cause of Clement, in the hopes of altering her purpose; and he next intended to despatch her into France on a similar errand to the French king. The saint, in the mean time, wrote on all sides in favour of Pope Urban. She despatched epistles to the three Italian cardinals, to Queen Joanna, and to the king of France, in which she described those who had any part in the election of Clement as members separated from their head, and demons incarnate! She also wrote to Charles, afterwards king of Naples, to excite him to make war on the schismatics. According to the statement of a holy friar, who was one of the friends of St. Bridget, and who wrote at this time in favour of Pope Urban, *several* of his friends had received divine revelations in prayer, in favour of that Pope's title<sup>7</sup>. St. Catharine of Sweden, daughter of St. Bridget, was a partisan of Urban<sup>8</sup>. The blessed Peter of Aragon also professed to receive revelations from God in favour of Pope Urban<sup>9</sup>. On the other hand, the blessed Peter of *Luxemburg*, who was beatified in 1517, was an adherent of the Clementine party. This illustrious personage was presented to a canonry in the cathedral of Paris by Pope Clement, when he had attained the respectable age of nine years! Two years afterwards, he became provided with two more prebends and two archdeaconries; which is in itself somewhat marvellous. When fourteen years of age, the pope advanced him to the management of the bishopric of Metz; a remarkable instance of the advantage derived from all ecclesias-

<sup>7</sup> Raynald. Annal. ann. 1379, n. 12.

<sup>8</sup> Raynald. ubi supra, n. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Raynald. ubi supra, n. 7.

tical patronage being placed absolutely in the papal power, without any obligation to observe the canons. At sixteen years of age, this eminent personage became a cardinal<sup>1</sup>. He was not yet in holy orders; but his piety was very remarkable, and his austerities were so great, that he fell ill and died; and although he had worked no miracles during his life, he began, (as it was said,) immediately after he was buried, to perform all kinds of cures, and these miracles were continued for many years. The cause of Pope Clement derived more advantage from these prodigies than can well be described. St. Vincent of Ferrer was also a Clementine saint, and did good service to the cause.

The support which Catherine of Sienna so warmly tendered to Pope Urban could not certainly have been based on any revelation concerning any peculiar *sanctity* in his character. Undoubtedly this pontiff possessed the character of a devout, humble, disinterested prelate, before his elevation to the papacy. He was zealous for chastity and justice; he said mass every day; he wore sackcloth day and night, fasted during Advent, and from Septuagesima, besides the fasts of obligation; and every night, when he retired to bed, he caused the Bible to be read to him until he fell asleep. Nothing can be more striking than such a character in many respects; but still there were some strange points in his character, after all. King Henry VIII. was not a good man, and yet he was, perhaps, as *merciful* a man as Pope Urban. We must describe one passage in the life of this pontiff.

While he was residing at Naples in 1384, he was secretly informed by the cardinal of Manupelle, that several of the cardinals of his own party had entered into a conspiracy against him, with a view to depose him, and deprive him of life. The

<sup>1</sup> The mode in which ecclesiastical preferments were distributed in the days of Rome's ascendancy, when the Reformation had not shorn it of its fair proportions, may be illustrated from the history of Giovanni de Medici, afterwards Pope Leo X. In the seventh year of his age he received the tonsure, and was declared capable of ecclesiastical preferment! In the following year, accordingly, he was appointed Abbot of Forte Dolce; and Pope Sixtus IV. presently after made him abbot of Passignano. At fourteen years of age he was nominated Cardinal; and he was at the same time, Canon of Florence, of Fièsole, and of Arezzo; Rector of Carmignano, Giogoli, S. Casciano, S. Giovanni in Valdarno, S. Pietro at Casale, S. Marcellino at Caecchiano; prior of Monte Varchi; Precentor of S. Antonio at Florence; proposto of Prato; Abbot of Monte Cassino, of S. Giovanni of Passignano, of S. Maria of Moribondo, of S. Martino of Forte Dolce in France, of S. Lorenzo of Coltibuono, of S. Salvatore at Vajano, of S. Bartolommeo at Anghiari, of S. Maria at Monte Piano, of S. Piuliano at Tours, of S. Giusto and S. Clement at Volterra, of S. Stefano at Bologna, of S. Michael in Arezzo, of Chiaravalle at Milan, of the Diocese of Pino in Pittavia, and of the Casa Dei at Chiaramonte; and Archbishop of Amalfi!!—Roscoe, Leo X. vol. i. note 7.

pontiff immediately seized six of the cardinals whom he suspected of being engaged in this conspiracy. Having caused them to be led to his chamber, he interrogated them with regard to the conspiracy, which they altogether denied. He then placed them in the hands of his nephew, Francis Prignano, whom our readers will remember, who put them to the torture, and they then made confession, and were thrown into prison.

The pope immediately declared these cardinals, whether unfortunate or guilty, deprived of all their benefices and property. He then appointed a commission of seven persons to examine them. The commissioners found the six cardinals loaded with heavy chains, and in extreme suffering. When the commissioners returned to the pope with a report of the result of their examination, some of them were so deeply affected by what they had seen, that they could not refrain from tears in the pope's presence. This enraged the pontiff, who inquired, "Why do you weep like women?" Thierrri of Niem, who remained after the others had left his presence, ventured to intreat his holiness to remove his court to some more secure place, and to pardon the cardinals who were accused; but the more he spoke, the higher grew the anger of the pope, his face became inflamed like a torch, and his voice was hoarse with agitation.

Thierrri in surprise remained silent, when the pope assured him that he was ill-informed on the subject, but that he would enable him to judge better. He then called for the confession of the Bishop of Aquila, whom on the preceding day he had caused to be cruelly tormented on the *rack*, and who had confessed more than the other prisoners. But though Thierrri observed that no dependence could be placed on confessions gained by torture, the pope was not in any degree softened.

It was in vain that several cardinals and the King of Naples interceded for the liberation of the imprisoned cardinals. The pope, after some time, held a consistory, before which these unhappy prelates were brought; and he promised to pardon them if they would confess their guilt; but they continued stedfastly to maintain their innocence, and were remanded to prison, where they lay in great misery, suffering from hunger, thirst, and cold; and devoured with vermin.

The pope now resolved to put them to the torture a second time; and the same commissioners were called in. They began with the Cardinal de Sangre, who was brought in irons. Having removed his clothes, the ministers of torture applied the rack with cruel violence. The pope's nephew, Prignano, who was at hand, laughed heartily; but one commissioner who was present

entreated the cardinal to say something to save his life ; and he accordingly said, " This affliction has been reserved for me by God's judgment. When I was legate in this kingdom, I spared neither bishops nor abbots, nor any one else, of whatever condition, believing that I should thus please the pope."

The pope next commanded one of his agents to inflict the torture on the Cardinal of Venice, and he added, " Torment him until I hear his cries." The unhappy cardinal, though aged, sickly, and of a delicate frame, was thus tormented from sun-rise to the hour of dinner, repeating at every blow of the cord, " Jesus Christ has suffered for us, leaving us an example." In the mean time the pope was walking in the garden beneath, repeating his breviary-office aloud, in order to remind the torturers to execute their commission. In the same way, the rest of the six cardinals were again put to the torture.

The pontiff shortly afterwards left Nocera with his court, but carried the prisoners with him, making them ride under guard near his person. The Bishop of Aquila could not ride as fast as the pope desired, because he was badly mounted, and still felt the results of the torture which had been inflicted on him. The pontiff, believing that he was making delays in the hopes of escape, became enraged ; and directed him to be put to death by the soldiers who accompanied him ; who, after having slain him with many blows, left him dead, and unburied.

The other prisoners accompanied the pope on his journey, and they at length arrived at Genoa, where their friends made an ineffectual attempt to release them from confinement. The pontiff here, at the request of Richard, king of England, released one of the cardinals, who was an Englishman, and whom he had deprived of all his benefices. The remaining five continued imprisoned in the pope's house. A church was annexed to the house ; and if persons came at unusual hours to that church, the pontiff suspected them of a design to release the imprisoned cardinals, and in various cases put them to the torture. The doge and citizens of Genoa in vain supplicated for mercy for the prisoners. The pontiff, at length, being about to proceed into the kingdom of Naples, caused them to be put to death in the night. The manner of their death is differently related. According to one account, they were thrown into the sea ; according to another, they were butchered, and then interred in a stable. The unhappy cardinals, however, terminated thus their tortures and their severe captivity.

It is remarkable, that Urban is not known in history as a pontiff remarkable for cruelty or ferocity ; and yet we think, that bad as was the conduct of Henry VIII., it was humane and

Christian in comparison with that of the pontiff, whose cause was supported by St. Catherine of Sienna, and by others whose names figure in the Romish Calendar.

In 1389, Urban VI. after a pontificate of eleven years, during which the Roman Catholic Church had been divided by schism, expired. The cardinals of his obedience immediately wrote letters to the Emperor of Germany, the Kings of Hungary, England, and Portugal, and the other states of the same obedience; and they then met in conclave, and chose Peter Tomacelli as pope, who took the name of BONIFACE IX.

Boniface was very active in endeavouring to gain over adherents to his party from the opposite party of Pope Clement. He sent into Sicily the Bishop of Puzzoli, with a form of *abjuration of schism*, in the hopes of bringing back to his communion those who had quitted it for that of Pope Clement<sup>2</sup>. He also sent the Patriarch of Grado into France with the power of absolving all persons, who were of Clement's communion, from the censures they had incurred, after having received their abjuration. He despatched a similar envoy into Spain; and to maintain more effectually his authority, he proceeded against Pope Clement, and published an excommunication against him and his adherents, which was met by a similar excommunication from Pope Clement. And thus these two parties, into which the Western Church was divided, continued, as they had been already for eleven years, separated from communion.

Pope Boniface left nothing untried with a view to reduce the whole of the Western Church to his obedience. In 1391, he sent a nuncio to Richard II., king of England, exhorting him not to make peace with France, or to have any communication with the French "schismatics," except for the purpose of "reducing them to the unity of the Church<sup>3</sup>." In the same year, Boniface published an encyclical letter, "in which he declaimed against schism, and alleged, as proofs of his own right, the revelations of Brother Peter, Infant of Arragon, and of St. Bridget;" and he also rejected with indignation the proposal which some persons begun to make, to submit the question between the two rival popes to the decision of a general council. He had also, the year before, given a commission to two cardinals to *sell the estates of churches and monasteries*, in order to maintain the war against the Clementine party in Naples; and he now sold more of the Church lands for the same purpose<sup>4</sup>.

These were not the only modes in which the pontiffs in those

<sup>2</sup> Fleury, liv. xcvi. n. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. n. 58.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. n. 57. 60.



ages provided for the necessities of the papal see and of religion. They had acquired the right of levying taxes at pleasure on the possessions of the clergy. During the whole of this century, we find the pontiffs levying *tenths* of the clerical income throughout the world, whenever it suited their convenience to do so. In fact, if they had a right to impose tenths upon the clergy at pleasure, they might have just as well taken away half or the whole of their incomes.

In 1391, the king and parliament of England took a step in opposition to the papal authority, which was in its principle altogether subversive of the papal authority. They enacted a law, that henceforward any one who should go beyond sea to obtain the provision of benefices from the pope, should be arrested and imprisoned as a rebel. Pope Boniface issued a bull *condemning* this law, in which he observed, that some seditious persons had persuaded the king to "renew the law of King Edward his father, conformable to that of another Edward," by which the elections to episcopal sees and other benefices were reserved to their proper patrons in England, according to the intention of the founders, under the penalties of *præmunire*. The pontiff concluded "by declaring null these laws, as well of King Richard as of the two Edwards, as notoriously contrary to the liberty of the Church and to the Roman Church; and orders all those who have possessed themselves of benefices under pretext of these laws, to resign them in two months, and restore the fruits of them." (Fleury, xcvi. 58.) This patronage of benefices throughout Europe, which the popes had become possessed of, was founded on the same right precisely on which the whole of their jurisdiction rested. They had *themselves* made laws reserving the patronage of all bishoprics and benefices to their own disposal; and this discipline had been *admitted* in numberless cases. The English were claiming a right, which had indeed existed formerly, but which was at an end, (according to the See of Rome,) by virtue of the legislation of the popes, who were superior to all powers, even to that of the Universal Church. Consequently, on this principle, the English were decidedly guilty of schism and rebellion against the See of Rome. If the particular Church and State of England in the time of Richard II. had the right of reclaiming their ancient rights, or of resisting what they deemed an unjust law of the papal see, they had a right to do the same in the reign of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. If they had no such right, then the pontiff has a right of disposing of all benefices in the Church, in spite of the opposition of the clergy and people.

We now come to an important era in the schism, which gave

a new character and complexion to the whole affair. Up to this point, that is, for about *sixteen* years, the Western Church was divided into two opposite parties and communions. The various nations of Europe had gradually arranged themselves into two distinct and separate obediences; so that the Church was decidedly divided in fact, although both communions professed to be obedient to their own pope. The division was as complete in the bosom of the Latin communion, as it was between the Latin communion and the Greek. There were, at this time, two branches of the Latin Church separated from mutual communion. We are now about to see a third communion established.

Amongst the adherents of the rival communions, a party was gradually arising, which seeing the hopelessness of unity being restored by ecclesiastical censures, or the submission of one of the parties to the other, began to look out for means of submitting the question to *some other tribunal than the popes themselves*.

The adherents of each party, tired of these disputes, began to entreat their popes to *restore the Church to unity*, and afterwards took the matter into their own hands. In 1387, some German princes sent privately to Pope Urban, to press him "to *re-unite the Church*." (Fleury, xcvi. 36.) To gratify the general desire, this pontiff instituted the feast of the "Visitation of the Virgin," the object of which was to "obtain *the union of the Church* by the intercession of the holy Virgin." This pontiff, however, did not dream of the union of the Church, except by the submission of the "schismatics." It was a dangerous experiment, under such circumstances, for the rival popes to express their wishes for "*union*," and to make any attempts for this purpose. They meant nothing but the "submission" of their opponents; they had no notion of making any concession themselves. But they were taken at their word by various princes, who set themselves in earnest to *unite* the Church, after some time.

The Urbanist Pope Boniface sent two Carthusian monks to the King of France, exhorting him to concur in putting an end to the schism, which had continued, he says, through "*the negligence of the sovereigns*." (Fleury, xcvi. 62.) This letter, which was only intended to lead the king to unite himself to the Urbanist communion, had effects of a very different kind. The king wrote to the princes of Italy of the Urbanist communion, "inviting them to concur in the *union of the Church*." (Fleury, xcvi. 64.) But this was not the most serious consequence. The University of Paris, rejoiced at this prospect of restoring the unity of the Church, went in procession, to return thanks in the Church of St. Martin-des-Champs, and there prepared a

letter, which they addressed to the king, on the *mode* of procuring the union of the Church and finishing the schism. This letter suggested three modes: *cassion* by the two contending popes—compromise—or a general council. The first was recommended as “the most prompt, and the most fitting to put an end to the schism.” The second was to consist in assembling a select number of prelates, or giving to certain individuals, chosen by the popes, the power of deciding the difference. “By this way,” they said, “the difference would be sooner ended, and he who would wish to avoid it, would render himself suspected of knowing the injustice of his title. And let it not be said that *the pope cannot submit himself to any one*; this would be to ascribe to him an attribute belonging to God only,—that of not being obliged to render an account to any one of his conduct.” The third way would be “a general council, which, according to form of law, ought only to be composed of prelates; but since, to our shame, many at present are ignorant, and many passionately devoted to one or the other party, an equal number of doctors of theology and law, from the famous universities, might be added on each side, and the deputies of cathedral chapters and of the principal religious orders might be joined.” The letter concluded thus: “We say boldly, that if one of the contending [popes] obstinately refuses these three ways without proposing another sufficient, he ought to be judged *an obstinate schismatic, and consequently a heretic*. Far from being the pastor of the flock of Jesus Christ, he is a deceiver and a tyrant; he must be no more obeyed, nor left any government or use of the patrimony of the Church. He ought to be driven away from the flock like a dangerous wolf, and punished with the severest penalties due to schismatics, since he does not care for the scattering and loss of the flock, and thinks of nothing but satisfying his own insatiable appetite.” (Fleury, xcix. 1.)

This letter, which was received by the King of France, and by him sent to Pope Clement, had such an effect on the pontiff, that after a passionate exclamation that these letters “were poisoned, and defamatory of the holy See,” he became ill, was seized with apoplexy, and died in 1394.

The cardinals of his party, before they could be prevented by the King of France, entered the conclave and elected Peter de Luna, Pope BENEDICT XII, having first signed a declaration, that they would all sincerely labour to “*put an end to the schism which now reigns in the Church*, and that if any of them were elected pope, he would, if necessary, yield that dignity, if the cardinals judged it expedient for the ‘*union of the Church*.’” (Fleury, xcix. 8.)

Strong as the language of the University of Paris was, the majo-

any of the Western Church afterwards fully recognized the validity of the principles enshrined in their letter: but it acted on them. It is worth while to pause for a moment to consider these principles. In the first place, the party represented by the University of Paris, and which ultimately became triumphant in the Church, set aside altogether the question of *who really was pope*. They did not deny or doubt that there was a legitimate "successor of St. Peter." They even admitted that there was a pope. But they maintained that because the Church was divided, the true pope as well as the schismatic antipope ought to resign, or to place his appointment at the disposal of individuals or of a general council. Now here was a very important principle. It was in fact maintained that although there was a true pope, yet part of the Church was not in communion with him; that union was not to be obtained by submitting to the true successor of St. Peter, but by expelling him from his see, if necessary—by forcing him to give up the care of the flock over which, according to their own principles, he had received full power from God. It was not held that those who were really separated from the communion of the "successor of St. Peter" were cut off from the Catholic Church. It was not held that they were schismatics or heretics. It was proposed, on the contrary, that the adherents of the two popes should unite in electing a new pontiff, or in forming a tribunal for the decision of the questions in dispute, or in assembling a general council; whereas, if one party had been considered to be in schism, they would, on all Catholic principles, have had *no jurisdiction*—no right to make decisions, or sit in councils.

It is, of course, easy to say, that the University of Paris held *false* principles, contrary to those of the Catholic Church. But the simple fact is, that the *great majority* of the Latin Church, before long, admitted those principles in the most material points by *acting on them*. The *true pontiff*, as well as the schismatic pontiff, were both ultimately deposed; and a new pontiff was elected, who was acknowledged by the great majority of the Western Church as the true pope. This new pontiff was unquestionably a schismatical intruder into the See of Rome; and yet the great body of the Latin Church adhered to this schismatic. The true pontiff was left with very few adherents. Whether he was of the Urbanist or the Clementine party, his communion only extended to *one nation*; and this proves sufficiently, that, on Romish principles, one nation severed from the rest of the Church may be Catholic,—nay, that the *whole* Church might be included in one nation.

But we must return to the thread of our history.

The King of France was quite in earnest for the "re-union of

the Church," as it was generally called ; and seeing that embassies to different princes did not produce any effect, he determined to force Benedict, *whom he acknowledged as pope*, to resign. He accordingly summoned a council, which was attended by the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, by seven archbishops, forty-six bishops, and many other dignitaries, all of whom agreed in recommending the pope to *resign* ; and the king accordingly sent ambassadors to the pontiff charged with this recommendation. The ambassadors, who were princes of the blood royal, required from the pope a copy of the declaration which he had signed as a cardinal before his election, and they pressed him to point out some way of procuring the "union." But the pontiff had not any inclination to adopt the way of *cession*, or resigning his office, though it was earnestly pressed on him ; and he could not be got to suggest any thing except a *conference* between him and his papal opponent. After repeated attempts to shake his resolution, the French princes were obliged to retire ; but they succeeded in engaging the cardinals of Benedict to unite with them in recommending the way of *cession*. The pope then issued a bull, by which he formally *rejected* this proposal ; but, notwithstanding this, the University of Paris and the great body of his adherents continued to agitate for it in every way ; and not content with continual writings on the subject, the University of Paris at length, in 1396, took the step of publishing a declaration against the pope, on pretence of certain censures alleged to be *intended* by him, and concluded with an appeal to a general council. The pope condemned this appeal as "contrary to the plenitude of the power which St. Peter and his successors have received from Jesus Christ, and to the sacred canons, which *prohibit appeals* from the holy See, or from the pope." (Fleury, xcix. 14.) This did not prevent the University from repeating their appeal, in which they mentioned instances of popes who had been *deposed* ; as Benedict V. in the council of Rome, A.D. 964 ; Benedict VI. ordained in 972, but shortly after imprisoned and strangled by Centius ; Benedict IX. expelled by the Romans in 1044, &c.

We shall presently see the results of this quarrel between Pope Benedict and his adherents, who were endeavouring to dragoon him into resigning the papacy. But we must look for a moment to the affairs of the opposite party.

Pope Boniface must have bitterly rued his letter to the King of France, when he became aware of its consequences. That active prince, when fairly engaged in the business, spared no pains to carry his point ; and he prevailed upon the King of England, the Emperor of Germany, and other princes of the *Urbanist* party, to press upon their own pope (Boniface) the

necessity of resigning—a proposal which this pontiff did not accept. His adherents may have been dissatisfied at this conduct ; but they remained subject to the pontiff, and there acted consistently with their principles ; so that Boniface remained in undisturbed possession of his power for some years longer.

But very different were the fortunes of the Clementine pope, Benedict XII. Irritated at the failure of all the negotiations which had gone on, and at the firm attitude maintained by their pope, the French, headed by the University of Paris, came to the conclusion, that the best way to *compel* Benedict to resign would be to withdraw all obedience from him, and to refuse to recognize his jurisdiction ; to maintain a neutrality between the contending pontiffs.

This resolution was arrived at by a great assembly of the prelates and nobles of the kingdom, who, in 1398, formally withdrew from their *obedience* of Benedict, *acknowledging him, at the same time, to be the pope*. Nothing, certainly, could be more self-contradictory than such a position. The king issued letters-patent, directing the mode of appointing bishops and clergy, during the substraction of obedience ; and as soon as all this was accomplished, Pierre D'Ailly, Bishop of Cambray, was sent to Avignon, to try and persuade the pope to resign, and Marshal de Boucicaut to compel him by force. The bishop failed in his attempt, for the pope's answer was, " I desire the union of the Church, and I have laboured much for it ; but, since God has appointed me to the pontificate, and you have elected me, I will remain pope as long as I live, and will not renounce it for king, duke, or count, nor by any means whatever."

On this, the marshal was called in, and he took possession of Avignon, opened a battery on the papal palace, and besieged the place. The pope himself was struck with some shot ; many of his people were killed. Such was the conduct of the French towards their pontiff. In the mean time, the example of France was followed by Spain. Castile withdrew from the pope's obedience. The King of Aragon alone remained faithful to his cause ; but nothing could induce the pontiff to resign his dignity, and he remained a prisoner in his palace for four years, deserted by the greater part of his obedience, Aragon alone remaining faithful. At length he escaped, being probably assisted in the attempt by the King of France, who saw that no menaces could bend him to his views ; and as soon as he was at liberty in France, all his cardinals, who had abandoned him, reconciled themselves to him ; and France, and the other countries of his obedience, again admitted his sway ; so that the Western Church was now once more reduced to *two* different communions, viz., the Urbanist,



headed by Pope Boniface, and the Clementine, by Pope Benedict.

In the mean time, Pope Boniface, who was rejoicing at the schism amongst his opponents, was raising money as fast as he could, in order to maintain himself in his own dominions, and to support his party in the kingdom of Naples. It is stated by a Roman Catholic historian, that when poor clergymen came to Rome to ask favours of the pope, they were obliged to pay for them; and the pontiff contrived to sell the same favours repeatedly, by signing many grants with the same date.—(Fleury, xcix. 36.) “During the first seven years of his pontificate,” says Fleury, “he did not dare openly to practise simony, on account of many good cardinals whom he had found in office, and who detested it. He, however, practised it privately, by means of certain agents, *chiefly in the promotion of prelates*; and if those of whom he asked money did not pay it down in cash, he devised various pretexts, which he alleged in the Secret Consistory, for delaying the appointments.” In 1398, he enacted a law, compelling all bishops and abbots to pay a year’s income to the pope on being appointed.—(Fleury, xcix. 27.) It is needless to accompany historians through the detail of his sales of benefices, and his exactions. The only reflection which occurs is, that these are results which arise from the possession of absolute power by the popes. The pontiffs were anxious to wrest the appointment to benefices from the laity and the clergy, on pretence of simony; but they were guilty of the same crime themselves. In the midst of occupations like this, the “successor of St. Peter” was carried off by death, after a pontificate of fourteen years, in 1403.

The schism had now continued from 1378 to 1403, a space of *twenty-five* years; during which the Church, which, according to the opinions of some people, can never be divided, but always remains indefeasibly united in itself, and in communion with the “successor of St. Peter,” was actually divided into *two*, and, for a time, *three* communions and Churches.

On the death of the Urbanist pope, the cardinals, before electing a new pontiff, engaged solemnly that whoever was elected should labour for “the union of the Church,” even if it were necessary to resign the pontificate in consequence. They then elected Cosmat de Meliorati, Pope Innocent VII., who summoned a general council to terminate the schism; but this design came to nothing, and the affair of the union made no material progress during his life, though there were various embassies and conferences on the subject between the opposite

parties; neither of the popes having any wish to arrange the difference, except by obtaining the submission of their opponents, which was doubtless the regular course to take. On the death of Pope Innocent, in 1406, the cardinals of his party, before proceeding to an election, took an oath that whoever was elected pope, should resign his dignity when the antipope should resign or die. Angelo Corrario was then elected pope, and took the name of GREGORY XII. Letters now passed between the two popes, Gregory and Benedict XIII., in which each offered to resign the papacy when his *opponent* did so. But these pontiffs were not sincere in their offers, apparently. It was in vain that their adherents pressed them to promote the union of the Church; they continued to elude the proposed resignation on a thousand pretences; and it was suspected at length by many persons, says *Thierri de Niem*, a contemporary historian, that "the two competitors had an understanding in order to put off the union."

Hitherto every thing had gone on tolerably smoothly with the Urbanist party; but now the affairs of the schism were to take a turn, which in a short time reduced both the rival parties to the extremest difficulty and distress. Early in 1408, Pope Gregory XII., having been in possession of the pontifical chair for two years, judged it expedient to create some cardinals. This proposal was strongly resisted by the cardinals of his party, who had all promised, before his election, that no more cardinals should be made during the schism; but there can be no doubt that, on the principles of the Roman Church, no such engagements could be binding on the *pope*. As the head of the Church, he was not bound by any rules, laws, canons, or engagements; but could dispense with them whenever he judged it expedient to do so. The cardinals, therefore, were bound to submit to his appointment of additional cardinals; but, instead of so doing, they left the papal court, which was then at Lucca, and retired, to the number of seven, to Pisa, where they published a protest against their pope's conduct, and an appeal, first to the pope better informed, "and if it be necessary to appeal from one person to another, we appeal from you to our Lord Jesus Christ, *whose vicar you are*, and who will judge the living and the dead. We appeal also to a general council, in which it is customary to *examine and judge all actions, even of the popes*. We appeal also to the future pope, to whom it belongs to reform what his predecessor has wrongly done." (*Fleury*, c. 8.) This was the tone adopted towards one whom, at the very same moment, they acknowledged to be "vicar of Jesus Christ." Unquestionably, these cardinals were plainly and manifestly *schismatics*, according to the prin-

ciples of the Roman Catholic Church, at that moment. They fully acknowledged his title as pope,—did not doubt the validity of his appointment, but simply disobeyed him.

It so happened that the Clementine party, at the same time, was embroiled more than ever. We have seen that, a few years before, the Clementines had quarrelled amongst themselves, and the greater part had for a time shaken off all obedience to their pope; but this had been reversed, and Pope Benedict found himself again in full possession of his jurisdiction. As soon as this happened, the pope very reasonably claimed the appointment to all the benefices which had been filled up without his sanction, during the years in which his jurisdiction had been suppressed. This was a stroke for which the King of France was not prepared, and he must have looked rather foolish on the occasion. He, however, again resorted to the very simple and inartificial contrivance of issuing an edict, forbidding his subjects from *obeying* the pope in this point. This was certainly cutting the Gordian knot. The pope was acknowledged to be the true pope. His *right* to appoint to benefices was allowed; but when he claimed the exercise of these rights, he was met by a royal edict. A nation which could think itself authorized in acting thus to the pope, was in fact admitting the principle that the papal jurisdiction is dependent on the will of sovereigns and of national Churches; and that it may be limited, restrained, suspended, or extinguished, as they please. Thus, according to the principles of the Church of Rome, the French and other adherents of Pope Benedict were decidedly schismatics, or even heretics, in their doctrines concerning the papal supremacy.

The pope, finding himself in want of money, next ordered the levy of a tenth of their incomes, on all the benefices of the Churches subject to him. This had been, for a long time, an established right of the popes; and if they were supreme in power, and not bound to render an account to any human being, as was supposed, they ought in all such cases to have been obeyed. Nevertheless, the University of Paris opposed this tax, and applied to the *temporal sovereign* to prevent it from being levied. (Fleury, xcix. 53.) Not content with this, they urged that obedience should again be withdrawn from the pope; and the French parliament and king made fresh regulations, withdrawing *provisionally* their obedience from him whom they, at the same time, recognized as the vicar of Christ. (Fleury, xcix. 57.) This act was declared to have no reference except to *pecuniary* matters, but it was as complete an act of *disobedience* to the pope as if they had rejected his spiritual jurisdiction. In fine, the king convened a general assembly of the prelates of France in 1406, when it was resolved

by the archbishops, bishops, and abbots, who attended in great numbers, that a general council should be assembled, and that all obedience should be withdrawn from the pope. (Fleury, xcix. 68.) Thus, then, France was, on ultramontane principles, most decidedly involved in schism and heresy; having formally renounced the obedience of the prelate whom they recognized as pope.

This step was taken, in opposition to the remonstrances of the pope, and of the University of Toulouse, which published a letter declaring that the withdrawal of obedience from Pope Benedict was a crime. (Fleury, xcix. 58.) It was also in opposition to the principles taught by the University of Oxford at the same time, who, in reply to a letter addressed to them by the University of Paris some years before, suggesting the alternative of cession or of withdrawal of obedience, replied thus:—"We do not blame the Spanish or the French for withdrawing from obedience to their pretended pope, they can do so with a safe conscience; perhaps they even wish thus to make reparation for the evil they have done in introducing the schism. But if they pretend that this way of forced cession or withdrawal of obedience is canonical and universal, and ought to be followed by those whose consciences do not reproach them, we absolutely deny it.

"*It is a mortal and very grievous sin, to refuse to our superior the obedience due to him; and here it is done without necessity, since there is another way to finish the schism, viz. that of a general council.*" (Fleury, xcix. 29.) Pope Benedict, in reply to the various attempts which were made by his adherents to coerce him into resigning his office, at length, in 1408, took the bold step of issuing a bull, excommunicating all who approved of such a proposal, or who refused obedience in any respect; and in case of disobedience, he pronounced a general interdict, suspended all incumbents, and released subjects from their oaths of allegiance. This had not the effect of reducing the schismatics to his obedience. Instead of submitting, the king, bishops, and parliament of France caused the papal bull to be publicly torn and burnt, while the University of Paris pronounced the pope to be an obstinate schismatic and heretic. The next step of the king was to write to the cardinals of the Urbanist party, inviting them to desert their pope, and to join with the cardinals of the Clementine party, promising to them all aid in his power.

Thus, then, the Gallican Church, after having adhered to Benedict as "the vicar of Christ" for twelve years, without ever disputing the legitimacy of his election, now rejected his authority, and virtually deposed him from the papacy; because he could not be coerced into resigning his see. Nothing could be *more inconsistent, more wicked, more cruel, than their treatment*

of Pope Benedict. This pontiff had only one fault—that of adhering firmly to the rights which they had themselves admitted for a long series of years. In every one of his acts he was fully justified by the practice and the principles of his predecessors.

We have already observed that the Urbanist cardinals had quarrelled with their pope, and separated from him in 1408. Thus the Clementine party and the Urbanists found themselves embroiled with their respective popes at the very same moment; and in the eagerness of the French king and others to re-unite the Church, measures were taken which only increased the division, and again split the Western Church into *three* communions or branches. For thirty years the Church had consisted of the two branches, or obediences, of the Urbanists and the Clementines, except when France and Castile had formed a third communion for some years, by rejecting the jurisdiction of their pope. But now a third communion was to be formed which was not only decidedly schismatical, on Roman Catholic principles, but which comprised *the greater part of the Western Church*.

The cardinals of Benedict united themselves to those who had separated from Gregory, and the latter summoned a general council.

“In the edict,” says Dr. Döllinger, “which fixed the opening of the council for the 20th of March, 1409, at Pisa, the cardinals (or rather only those of the Roman obedience) endeavoured to justify their proceedings. It was certain, they said, and acknowledged by the universities, and in particular by that of Bologna, that the two rival popes were bound, both by their oaths, and by the uncertainty of their right, to *resign*: that by their obstinate refusals, they had made themselves abettors of schism, and that all were bound to withdraw from their obedience. As neither of the popes could call the council, or preside therein, this duty had fallen to the cardinals. But they forgot that by their assertion, that it was doubtful who was the lawful pope, they *also placed in doubt their cardinalitian dignity, their right to take this step, and the lawfulness of the approaching council*.”

At the council of Pisa, which was held in 1409, there were present nearly one hundred bishops, besides the cardinals of both parties, and abbots, together with ambassadors from many sovereign princes. The two popes, Benedict and Gregory, were cited to appear before this assembly, which declared itself a general council, and after commanding all Christians to withdraw obedience from the popes, they pronounced them incorrigible schismatics and heretics, deposed them, and elected in their place a new pope, who intitled himself ALEXANDER V.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Döllinger, Church Hist. translated by Dr. Cox, vol. iv. p. 146.

<sup>6</sup> Döll. vol. iv. p. 149, 150.

The patriarch of Alexandria, assisted by the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, had the honour of pronouncing the judgment of the council against the pope ; thus assuming an equality with the See of Rome, which has been so frequently denied. If the patriarch of Alexandria could pass judgment on the Pope of Rome, he could not have been inferior to him in dignity and jurisdiction. Thus, the decision of the council of Pisa was an act of schism and disobedience on all principles recognized in the Roman Church. It was a mere rebellion of children against their parent—of sheep against their shepherd. It had not been hitherto pretended that there was *no pope*. It had been admitted that there *was* “a successor of St. Peter;” but now they deposed him’, *because* he refused to resign the pontificate.

But the remarkable point here is, that the *great majority* of the Church adhered to the cause of the Council of Pisa<sup>7</sup>. All Europe, with the exception of Spain which adhered to Benedict, and a small part of Italy which adhered to Gregory, acknowledged Alexander V. who had been elected at Pisa as the pope. This took place in 1409. Thus almost the whole of the Western Church gave its sanction to the principle, that it was lawful to compel a pope to resign his see ; that it was lawful to withdraw from his obedience ; that it was lawful to depose him, in case of his not acceding to the wishes of those who were subject to him ; that it was lawful to seat another in his pontifical jurisdiction. If the prelates of this council derived their jurisdiction only from one or other of the popes whom they deposed, how could they have any power to depose them ? The pope could not have given them jurisdiction to disobey himself. In disobeying him, they at once ceased to possess any jurisdiction on all principles recognized now by Roman Catholics ; and therefore their act of deposal of the pope, and election of Alexander V., was *null and void*. It was grossly schismatical, and the new pontiff was an usurper and a schismatic, without power of giving jurisdiction, or of performing any spiritual act. And yet, almost the whole of the Roman Catholic communion united itself to this schismatic—this unlawfully elected pope—and separated from obedience to the legitimate “successor of St. Peter,” whether he were Gregory or Benedict<sup>8</sup>. And this state of schism continued for seve-

<sup>7</sup> The Ultramontanes all hold that Gregory was the true pope. Raynald. says, “Cum ostenderimus supra Urbanum VI. rite electum, et perspicuum sit Gregorium ejus legitimum extitisse successorem, ipsum verum fuisse Pontificem, et apud errantes tantum ambiguum fateri debemus.” Raynald. 1409, n. 79.

<sup>8</sup> Raynald says of Alexander V., “Acceptis, ut dictum est, in Pisanis conventibus papalibus insigniis, ac summa reneratione a maximâ Christiani orbis parte cultus.” An. 1379, n. 84.

<sup>9</sup> The Pisan Pope and his adherents were denounced by Gregory as well as



ral years. It was not till 1415 that Pope Gregory resigned the papacy; nor did Pope Benedict resign at all. He died in 1424, and his successor, Clement VIII., resigned the papacy in 1429, thus terminating the schism. If, then, the Urbanist succession be acknowledged as legitimate (as it is generally by Roman Catholic writers, and by all Ultramontanes); the Council of Pisa, and its pope, Alexander V., and his successor, John XXIII., together with, by far, the greater part of the Western Church, *were involved in decided schism, if not heresy, for, at least, six years*, from the Synod of Pisa to the resignation of Pope Gregory; or else communion with the pope is unnecessary. If the *Clementine* pope was the true successor of St. Peter, the greater part of the Church fell into schism and heresy for twenty years.

It is not possible to solve this difficulty by saying, that the universal Church *could not err*, and that, therefore, Alexander V. and his successor, being accepted by the Church, generally, were the true successors of St. Peter, and Gregory and Benedict must have been schismatics.

In the first place, it is not certain, on Roman Catholic principles, that the *larger* party must have been the Catholic Church. We have seen above, that, according to the principles of Bellarmine and others, the *minority*—even a single province—might have been the Catholic Church. The majority may have been schismatics in obeying Alexander V. In the next place, unless the Church can exist for a long series of years without any pope, either Gregory or Benedict must have been the true pope. The question recurs, then, whether the *legitimate* “successor of St. Peter,” and “Vicar of Christ,” can lawfully be *deposed* by those who are subject to him. If the pope can be deposed by those

Benedict. The former had admonished his cardinals who were in rebellion at Pisa that the cardinals of Benedict with whom they were invited were schismatics, and that they were themselves deposed in consequence of holding communion with schismatics. He declared to them that those alone who adhered to him were Catholics, and that all others, however numerous, would be schismatics. He condemned the synod of Pisa; held a council in which both Benedict and the Pisan pope were condemned; and sent legates to various parts of Europe to confirm the people in his obedience. In 1410, he addressed a letter to the Catholics living amidst the “schismatics” in Italy, making regulation for the payment of tithes to charitable or religious purposes, when the bishops and clergy were “involved in the guilt of schism.” He declared that the followers of the Pisan Council “were endeavouring to drown with themselves all the people in the pit of eternal damnation.” (Raynald. 1410, n. 4.) In 1412, he published an encyclical letter authorizing all the faithful and Catholics, who were “living amidst sacrilegious multitudes of schismatics” to receive the sacrament from any Catholic priest, and he also prescribed a form for renouncing the schism of the antipopes, and being admitted to the Catholic communion. (Rayn. 1412, n. 1.) Thus the Pisan Council and the majority of the Church remained condemned by this pope, and separated from his communion, till the Council of Constance, when he resigned. Benedict was equally resolute in condemning the adherents of the Pisan Council.

who are subject to him ; *i. e.* if they *may constitute themselves his judges*, and entirely withdraw from his obedience, ultramontaniam is at an end. It is in vain to allege, as some writers have done, that, provided *some* pope, whether true or false, be adhered to, the unity of the Church is maintained. Would those who adhered to an *antipope* be members of the Church ? Then, if so, the pope has no real authority : communion with the true pope is not necessary. If those who adhered to antipopes, and were *not in communion* with the real pope, or the Catholic Episcopate, were good Catholics ; what becomes of the Roman Catholic doctrine of unity ? If the whole *jurisdiction* of the Church flows from the "successor of St. Peter ;" if sacraments cannot be validly administered except by powers derived from him ; can those who are separated from him, and obedient to a schismatic who usurps the place and authority of the true pope, and who is an "anti-christ," be *Catholics* ? Can they be in the Church at all, when their bishops and clergy have no mission or jurisdiction from the "Vicar of Christ ?" Such persons are not in communion with the pope and the episcopate ; they have, on ultramontane principles, *no bishops or clergy*, and no sacraments. They are formally *excommunicated* by authority of the true "successor of Peter," and of the episcopate joined to him. Is it, then, possible, that ultramontanes can allow that such persons may be Catholics ?

If mere *belief* in the papal authority, and conscientious adherence to an *antipope*, be all that is necessary to Catholic unity, the Roman Catholic Church has always been *in error* in treating antipopes and their adherents as schismatics.

The principles on which the Council of Pisa proceeded, and which were recognized by the great majority of the Western Church, were decidedly contrary to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church at present :—

"Gerson," says Dr. Döllinger, "in the work which appeared at the beginning of the year 1409, in defence of the approaching Synod of Pisa, maintained the *false principle*, that as two competitors asserted an equal right to the same dignity, the contest would be most easily terminated by excluding both, and introducing a third party. The unity of the Church could, he said, be preserved by its connexion with its invisible head, Christ ; and whenever the pope was either corporally or civilly dead, or *was not recognized by the faithful*, the Church could give to itself a new head in a council convened by the cardinals. He proceeded to still further lengths in his book, 'On the Separation (*auferabilitas*) of the Pope from the Church,' wherein he wished to prove, that there could exist cases, in which the pope might be deprived of his dignity, as the Church must have the same right, which, (according to the Aristotelian system,) other free states enjoy—*deposing an incorrigible sovereign.*"—(*Döllinger*, iv. 147, 148.)

These were the principles of the leaders of the Synods of Pisa and Constance; of those who adhered to Alexander V. and his successor John XXIII.; and who formed the vast majority of the Western Church. Their position, in communion with pontiffs, who had only been elected after the Synod of Pisa had pretended to *depose* the existing pope, depended entirely on the admission of such principles: and they formally enforced them in the Synod of Constance, which was assembled by the Emperor Sigismund, and Pope John XXIII., in 1414; and in which it was decreed, that a council is superior to a pope; that it is capable of reforming the Church in its *Head* and its members. —(Döll. iv. 164.) This council also proceeded to act on these principles by *deposing* Pope John XXIII., and proceeding to a new election. We have thus *two instances* in succession, in which popes were deposed by councils who pretended to authority over the See of Rome, and whose decisions were received and acted on by the great body of the Roman Catholic Church. The titles of these popes were not doubted or denied by the councils which deposed them: they were acknowledged to be “vicars of Jesus Christ;” but because they would not act in the manner prescribed to them by their inferiors, they were disobeyed, and a schism was excited against them.

The Synod of Pisa was, as we have seen, convened without papal authority, which, according to the maxims then as now received in the Roman Communion, was essential to enable it to represent the Universal Church, or act with its authority. Pope Gregory held another synod at the same time, in which it was condemned; and Pope Benedict also held a synod, which was even more numerously attended than that of Pisa; so that the latter could not be considered as an œcumenical synod, except on the supposition that there was no real pope in existence, which could not be maintained by a synod which did not attempt to deny the legitimacy of the election of one or other of them. It was by a pope, deriving his title from the proceedings of the Synod of Pisa, that the Council of Constance was summoned. Thus, neither of these synods were really general synods: they were both held in opposition to the legitimate pontiff, whether he were Benedict or Gregory.

Thus, then, if Roman Catholics of the present day have the satisfaction of thinking, that the assemblies which deposed these pontiffs, asserted the superiority of councils to the pope, and held that popes might fall into schism and heresy, were not in *reality* œcumenical synods, because incompetently summoned, and not attended or received by the bishops of more than one “obedience;” they have on the other hand to admit, that the branch or communion which included *almost the whole* of the

Roman Catholic Church, was separated from the true successor of St. Peter, and sanctioned proceedings which rested on the principle, that a legitimately-elected pope might be disobeyed and deposed by his inferiors.

When the Council of Constance was assembled by one of these rival popes in 1414, the Western Church had been, for *thirty-six years*, separated into different branches, mutually excommunicated, and in one case or the other separated from the communion of the "successor of St. Peter." And yet, strange to say, there are scarcely any Roman Catholic writers who will venture to affirm, that *the Church of Christ was, during that long space, restricted to one of those communions*. Tournely, Delahogue, Bailly, Perrone, and the Romish theologians in general, hold that these different obediences were all *parts of the Church*. The same doctrine was taught on all sides by the most eminent universities, theologians, popes, bishops, councils, in that age. The invariable call was for the "reunion of the *Church*." Although the different branches were separated from communion, they admitted that the Church was *divided*; and that it still existed in these different branches. Döllinger himself remarks, that although the Council of Constance, which decreed the superiority of a council to the pope, "assumed the authority of an œcumenical council, representing the universal Church; it, in truth, consisted of *only those who were in obedience to the Pisan Pope, whilst those in obedience to the others, had neither been formally called, nor were they represented*." So that, according to this writer, the union of the obediences of the *three* popes was necessary in order to represent the universal Church, *i. e.* all three, though *mutually excommunicated, were parts or branches of the Catholic Church*.

It is curious to see how tenderly Romish writers tread in approaching these questions. They are in a great dilemma. If they here apply their principles of the eternal unity of the Church, the utter impossibility of its being divided into different communions, or of being severed from the "successor of St. Peter" at Rome, they can indeed carry on the thread of Catholicity through the schism, but they are compelled to admit that the Catholic Church did not possess at that time the attribute of "*universality*." The Clementine branch could not claim *universality* for their communion; and though the Urbanist branch was more widely extended, and might, for a time, put in such a claim; they were reduced to a mere handful by the insurrection of the Pisan Council. Then again, if the acts of the Pisan Council were valid, not only the Gallican principles are established, but the right of insurrection against a pope, for the imagined benefit of the Church, is conceded. In this dilemma, therefore, Roman Catholic writers do

not venture to pronounce the Urbanist, or the Pisan, or the Clementine parties schismatical. If the Urbanist or the Clementine party were schismatical, the Pisan was also, because it included members of *both* parties, who joined in acts of jurisdiction without receiving any absolution from censures, or making any acknowledgment of schism. There is, therefore, no help for it. All three *must have been* Catholic, and formed one holy Catholic Church! And so it is resolved by the Roman Catholic divines as a body. But, then, there comes a difficulty which is of the most serious nature, that *the Church was divided, its attribute of inviolable external unity was gone; its unity became invisible!*

It is not without reason, therefore, that the new advocates of Romanism, such as Mr. Thompson, Mr. Renouf, and the "Dublin Review," have provided for the unity of the Church by sacrificing its Catholicity, and have maintained that the Church may be "*the least of all communions.*" It matters not, we suppose, that this doctrine is in opposition to the doctrine of the fathers, and to all the assertions of Romanists for ages past. Its novelty is, on the principle of "development," a presumption of its truth; and we presume that its occasional manifestation amongst the Donatists, the Lutherans, and Calvinists, must be regarded as one amongst those "anticipations," of which the author of the Essay on Development speaks; while the contrary doctrine of St. Augustine and the fathers, and of Bossuet and most of the modern Roman Catholic divines, must have arisen from an imperfect comprehension of the "idea" of Christianity. Henceforward the position of Romanists is to be, that the true Church of Christ is inviolably one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic; but that it may be the least of all Christian communions. It may be a mere handful, like the seven thousand in Israel. In short, the Greek or the English Church, may, as far as *Catholicity* is concerned, be the true Church, instead of the Roman. The Jansenist Church of Utrecht may be so likewise, we suppose. In this latter case, indeed, the principles laid down by those who admit that the three branches of the Roman Catholic Church, in the fifteenth century, were all of them Catholic, fully exculpate the Jansenists, during the whole of their controversy, from schism. These members of the Roman Catholic Church always professed their belief in the authority of the pope as the centre of Catholic unity. They professed reverence for the "chair of Peter," and inviolable adherence to it; but they exercised the right which the "priest of the order of Charity," and Mr. Thompson, and every other Romanist admits, of objecting to the "particular exercise" of the papal authority which they disapprove. The Jansenists *appealed* to a general council, and in so doing they merely acted on principles admitted by

Romanists themselves; they simply exercised the right claimed even by the new converts to Romanism, amidst all their ultra-monachism. In consequence of this, they were separated from the communion of the pope, and of the bishops adhering to him, but they have never yet denied the papal supremacy; and therefore, on the principles of the great mass of Romish theologians, they are at this moment Catholics,—they are *potentially* united to the Church.

This must doubtless sound very strange to those who have been so long and so assiduously taught, that the Catholic Church can never be divided into different branches—that it must at all times remain perfectly united—that unity is an essential characteristic—that it never can be divided or separated from the pope, the successor of St. Peter—that the papacy is necessarily the centre of Catholic unity—that he who is not in the papal communion is not of the Church—that there is no jurisdiction, or power of administering the sacraments, except as derived from the pope. If the Church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries could be separated into two or three branches for *fifty-one* years, that is, from 1378 to 1429, what is there to prevent the supposition that it might have continued in the same state for sixty, or eighty, or a hundred, or several hundred years? If the Church could be divided even for a few years, unity of communion, however sacred a duty, is not of its essence. It might exist without such a unity as consists in being subject to one earthly head, and united in one communion. Admit that it could exist for ever so short a time under such circumstances, and the whole theory of Roman Catholic theology falls to the ground.

Supposing even, as some persons have contended (in the hope of excusing the different branches of the Roman Catholic Church from schism)—that the titles of all the popes during the schism were *dubious*, and therefore that there was no schism; does it not follow that the Church was without *any real pope* for a space of forty or fifty years? Is a doubtful pope a real pope? We are frequently told by Romanists, that if the ordinations of our clergy are doubtful, we have no true priests. Is it to be supposed that if God had designed the Church to depend wholly on the papacy—if He had made the pope the *source of all jurisdiction*, the source of all unity, the foundation-stone of the whole Church, He would or could have left his Church for forty or fifty years without this essential and vital element of its being? To say so would amount simply to the assertion that the Church came to an end in the schism! If there was none but a doubtful pope, the bishops of the Church had, on Roman Catholic principles, only a doubtful jurisdiction; the validity of the sacraments they administered doubtful; the authority of the synod they formed was doubtful; the election of popes by the cardinals was performed



by doubtful authority; there was from that moment no certainty that a Church existed, or that a pope presided in it.

There is another point for consideration. The great majority of the Latin Church in accepting the decisions and acts of the Councils of Pisa and Constance, admitted the principles of Gallicanism, on which they were based. Gallicanism is a grievous error, on the principles of the Romanists of the present day. Here then comes this question: if the great majority of the Latin Church received and acted on an *error* in accepting the Gallican doctrines, is there any thing incredible in the supposition that they were in error in receiving the doctrine of the papal supremacy itself? If two general councils, so called; if the Bishops of France, Germany, England, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Poland, Sweden, and all Europe, except the little state of Rimini, and the kingdom of Aragon, recognized the Councils of Pisa and Constance, and the popes they appointed, and the Gallican principles which they taught, and erred in so doing, the Roman Catholic Church is capable of error, and of error in matters concerning the faith. If the Council of Pisa, *then* received by the Western Church—if the Council of Constance, also received by the Western Church, erred in their doctrine of the subjection of the papacy to a general synod—the Synod of Lyons, and the Synod of Florence, and the Synod of Lateran, may have been also mistaken in asserting the papal supremacy, even if the Western Church in general received them. If it was lawful to relinquish the doctrine of the Council of Pisa and Constance as to the subjection of the popes to general councils, it was also lawful to relinquish the doctrines of the Council of Lyons, or any other councils sanctioning the papal supremacy. The papacy and its adherents, in abandoning the doctrine once universally prevalent in the Roman Catholic Church, have authorized the Reformation to apply the very same principle to other matters. If it was lawful to relinquish the doctrines of the fifteenth century, there could be no reason why those of the three or four preceding centuries should not be abandoned. If the Latin Church might err in believing the pope to be the head of the Church—it might err in the doctrine of transubstantiation, in the worship of creatures, in other points; and yet, notwithstanding these errors, it might not have entirely forfeited its Christian character. These may seem to be paradoxes and contradictions: it may be easy to turn them into ridicule: there is no doctrine of the gospel, from the Trinity downwards, that has not been put in an absurd and self-contradictory point of view: but the positions we have here put forward, are, whatever else they may be, simply derived from the history and the principles of the Roman Catholic Church itself.

ART. VI.—*The Life of Mrs. Godolphin.* By JOHN EVELYN.  
*Edited by the Bishop of Oxford.* London: Pickering, 1847.

WE ventured in a former number to add ourselves to that multitude of Mentors who have taken upon themselves somewhat to direct us, as the more restive of our pupils might term it, to "instruct" the female sex. The love of advising, it is said, grows, swells, expands into vast dimensions on the least encouragement. Advisers are a garrulous, a voluminous race, "fellows," as King Harry says, "of infinite tongue." The pen that has once struck off a lecture thirsts for ink: the tongue that has once tasted the sweets of admonishing goes simmering on in endless precepts. Additional remarks, a few more words, postscripts and post postscripts reek from the overflowing brain; and we have seen the self-complacent counsellor heaping "Alps upon Alps" of misguided superfluous admonition, notwithstanding the marked impatience or unconcern of the vexed or drowsy listener.

Now we must not be supposed to be possessed of this passion for advising, if, amid the "sterner stuff" of this Review provided chiefly for the sterner sex, we again invite the attention of the female ear, and thus provoke the transportation of our pages from the grave tranquillity of the library to a more cheerful position on the drawing-room table. We would remind our female readers, that a year has passed since we disputed the infallibility, despised the vague and vapid nostrums of Mrs. Ellis, and raised ourselves into a rival chair. What lovers of advising, we ask, could content themselves with an annual ebullition? Abstinence like ours lifts us at once above the charge of delighting in that continuity of lecturing to which nothing can be compared but the hot and lengthy monotony of a Devonshire lane on a summer's day.

But though we have no design of "breaking out into a second course" of instruction, we confess ourselves not unwilling to trim and garnish our former remarks with any notable illustrations that may come to hand, and to welcome the labours of other writers which strengthen the opinions we advanced. That we took a high standard for women then, we are ready to allow; but as that standard was framed from no imaginary portraits of an imaginary ancestry, but from the contemplation of actual Churchwomen of old, we have no recantation to make, no "second thoughts" wherewith to sponge out or qualify the first: and yet

as we feel that that standard may have been looked upon as somewhat extreme and overstrained, we hail with no little joy the appearance of any real biographies which prove the practicability of our views, and we thankfully lengthen the line of genuine female portraits that brighten the walls of our spiritual house, the English Church. In this spirit of thankfulness we have received the fair Memoir of Mrs. Godolphin, written by good John Evelyn, which the Bishop of Oxford has so gracefully shaperoned into the literary world; and we hasten to slice some extracts from so interesting a work that we may give our readers a taste of its excellence.

It is rare indeed that so great a gap of time lies between the author and his critics: while our pens are commonly employed in commenting on the new-blown volumes of to-day, the produce of living men, we find the worthy Evelyn in his antiquated garb offering us a work as new and unknown as the newest of the press amidst the spruce and jostling crowd of modern publications. The long dormant memoir of his saintly friend has now for the first time burst "into this breathing world;" and we can well imagine the innocent pride which would have warmed the good man's heart could he have foreseen a Bishop of the Church acting, with evident relish, as the usher to this offspring of his pen. It is not a little remarkable that after such long concealment the manuscript should have found at last a birthday so reasonable and well-timed. Had it burst from its shell at an earlier day, it would have fluttered for a while almost without remark, or at least without effect, and sunk into a premature and undeserved grave. A century ago how few would have had any heart or relish for such a work! But it will not be wasted on this generation: we are wanting now to learn what manner of children the English Church can really rear; we are beginning to look back to the fruits of her former grace; and every fresh saint whose features we are able to scan helps to cheer and strengthen us in our attachment to the Church of our fathers. While a thousand theories and a thousand arguments confuse and stun our ears, we thankfully refresh ourselves with that best rhetoric, the real histories of real life, which prove the richness of our Church's soil.

For our own parts we must confess it is no slight satisfaction to feel ourselves once more on the "terra firma" of real biography amid real people and scenes and facts, after so much ballooning amid the clouds of fiction. We have been drugged and surfeited with tales; and though we delight in imaginary pictures of life, provided they are moderately supplied, it is possible to be drenched as well as cooled by the waters of imagination. We prefer

varying the strata of fiction by alternate layers of reality ; and we abhor a monopoly of fiction as much as we dislike a despotism of facts. There is something highly discouraging in the constant contemplation of heroes and heroines of air ; and after gazing at the vast forms of unreal life through the magnifying glasses of imagination, there is a temptation to sink into inactive despair. When a race of moral giants has been stalking before our eyes, we feel that our powers stretched to tiptoe height would leave us at a dwarfish distance after all. We may like to look at giants, but practical imitation is not attempted : whereas, while the accounts of real life, and memoirs of real persons, once of like passions with ourselves, may raise a high standard before our minds, we are comforted by the consciousness that that standard may be reached.

But, besides something like an overflow of religious tales, these imaginary works have, of late, taken an unsatisfactory and unhealthy turn ; they have been dipping into controversy, contrasting one system with another, and conducting theological arguments by the aid of lovers and young ladies amid all the light machinery that belongs to tales. Now, though the temptation may be strong in controversial times to plunge into that troubled sea, yet fiction leaves its proper sphere when it embarks therein. Arguments will be but half carried out ; tastes and feelings will be made the chief ground of conversion from one system to another ; contrasts will be partial or incomplete ; systems will be judged wholesale by particular instances, and those instances imaginary ; the defects of one matched against the virtues of another ; the defects exaggerated in this tale, the virtues in that ; while even the most conscientious endeavour to represent schools, or opinions, or practices impartially, finding a vent only through the contrast of imaginary characters, will be treated as partial and one-sided. Away with the airy web of imagination when we want thoroughly to argue great religious questions ! Fiction should deal with characters, not arguments ; and though characters may represent systems, or the effect of systems, yet that indirect mode of commending a system should be used *dogmatically*, as though there were none other in the world. Direct controversial fictions must be unsatisfying ; we could not but despise a person who could be argued out of his Church by a tale ; a proselyte so won would be but a doubtful gain ; a member so lost would be but a doubtful loss. Another tale might wash out the impression of the first. The able author of "Tremaine" long since made the experiment of tricking his readers into a formal theological discussion through the medium of a novel ; but a paper-box cannot be successfully inlaid with iron ;

and the third volume into which he ingeniously inserted his discussion, will be found commonly to have escaped that peculiar colouring which a well-thumbed novel is apt to gather in its passage through the reading world. The discussion was universally skipped.

It is on these grounds that we lament the appearance of such works, amongst others, as "Margaret Perceval," and "From Oxford to Rome." In the latter production, we know not what to believe or to doubt, as the veins of truth and fiction are continually running into each other. It has, indeed, worked some good without intending it, as it led to a correspondence which made a fresh exposure of the disingenuousness into which Romish principles seem to lead naturally ingenuous minds. For the authoress, we cannot but feel sincere concern; and we can only hope that she may find sufficient strength to extract herself from a position in which her conscience, as far as we can detect its own freer motions, is not altogether at ease, and to return to the bosom of that Mother, towards whom she casts some "longing lingering looks." As regards "Margaret Perceval," it is just one of those cases in which we really desire to see the play of Hamlet with the part of the Prince of Denmark left out. We warmly admire all but the principal portion of the tale; and though the contrast between the Anglican and Romish Church forms the Hamlet of the book, the pivot on which it turns, we look upon it as an intrusive episode, and hasten for our enjoyment to the underplot and lesser scenes which are written with all the author's force and ability. As we rank ourselves among the most cordial of her admirers, and hope we have not only been interested but improved by her former works, we feel less scruple in giving these candid and friendly hints. When we again greet her on the literary field, we hope to see her confining herself to the task, in which she so well succeeds, of simply striving to make the members of our Church more earnest, more holy and consistent in their lives, without reference to any of the over-laden or defective systems that surround us.

We must not, however, keep our readers standing at the threshold of Evelyn's biography, but without further preface, must lead them into the inviting chambers of his fair handy-work. Margaret Blagge, afterwards Mrs. Godolphin, whose Isaac Walton he is, was some years younger than Evelyn, though she died before him; and, accordingly, to use the vague phrase of classical dictionaries, she "flourished" in the shameful reign of Charles II., when the English mind, stiffened and congealed by the fanaticism of the preceding period, and then relaxed by a sudden thaw, broke into the opposite extreme of wild licenti-

ousness. There was, indeed, a remnant of bright souls who served God with the stricter rule, and having passed through troublous times, had learnt the comfort as well as "the beauty of holiness." It thus became an age of strong contrasts; what light there was, was very light, while the darkness was very dark; and in the most dissolute portion of our history we are able to number the most able and pious of divines, the most devout of lay-members of the Church. Mrs. Godolphin's mother had had her share of troubles; her husband, Colonel Blagge, an unwavering adherent of Charles I., having suffered all the hardships of a steadfast loyalty: but trouble had done its proper work, and Evelyn bears witness, that "she was a woman soe eminent in all the vertues and perfections of her sex, that it were hard to say whether were superior her beauty, witt, or piety." A good mother often repeats herself in her child; and while Mrs. Blagge was able to hand down her natural gifts of wit and beauty to her daughter, she took especial pains to crown and guard those gifts with the principles of piety,—that her child might not be wanting in the best of her own possessions. Her forwardness in the culture of the soul was met by a corresponding aptness on the child's part, "whose extraordinary discernment soone advanced to a great and early sense of religion." On such good ground did the good seed fall, that she was brought to be confirmed by Bishop Gunning at an unusually early age; and the bishop, it appears, "was soe surprised at those early graces he discovered in her, that he thought fitt she should be admitted to the Holy Sacrament when she was hardly eleaven years of age." An early confirmation and an early communion are often of the very highest service in fixing strong religious feelings, and in ripening the religious character. We often wish that, in particular cases, age was somewhat less considered in the present day, and that young persons of a decidedly religious turn were sooner invited to receive the strong meat of the Church; they would thrive like trees growing on a sunny wall. Margaret Blagge certainly profited by her early use of those means of grace; "for, from that moment forwards," says Evelyn, "young and sprightful as she was, she was observed to live with great circumspection, prescribing to herselfe a constant method of devotion, and certaine days of abstinence, that she might better vacate to holy duties, and gaine that mastery over her appetite, which, with all other passions, she had strangely subdued to my often admiration."

There was full need of all this preparation; for she was soon to be launched on as dangerous waters as a young spirit was ever constrained to cross. After but a short school-time for her soul, she was called upon to act with all the decision of a matured



character in scenes that were sufficient to shake the principles of any who were not ripe scholars in heavenly things. The Duchess of York demanded her for her maid of honour; and she was thrust alone upon that glittering court, where religion was a jest, and dissoluteness in honour: "a surprising change of aire," truly exclaims Evelyn, "and a perilous climate for one soe very young as she, and scarcely yett attained to the twelfth year of her age." Even in a court like ours, at this present time, where what is honourable is duly honoured, it must be a strange fiery trial to live for a world to come, and to keep a vivid sense of heavenly things amid all the pomps and pride of life and grandeur that glare upon the mind; though there may be no temptation to be immoral now, yet there must be temptation to become "lovers of the world." To resist being worldly must be the great struggle; and the more so, because this "being worldly," consists not so much in any definite tangible actions, as in a general tone, and turn, and temper of mind. What, then, must have been the trial of a mere girl, when she found herself alone in a vicious court?

She continued with the duchess till her death, when she was transferred to a like office in the household of the queen. She was thus compelled to continue in that "perilous climate" of court life, at a time when those who possessed, like herself, the shining but dangerous gifts of wit and beauty, were wont to desecrate them by dressing up and gilding vice with increased attractions. But when she found herself bound in that glittering captivity, she fastened herself all the more resolutely to the cross; and that she might the better keep a thoughtful undazzled mind amid all that stir of pleasure, she wisely prepared for herself a code of rules bearing upon her particular temptations, which would act as checks or staffs to steady her in that slippery place. It is always interesting to see what means the saints before us have successfully employed in the management of their souls; and Evelyn happily was able to preserve the rules of his friend, the pith of which we shall extract for our reader's benefit:—

"My life, by God's grace, without which I can doe nothing.

"I must, till Lent, rise atte halfe an hour after eight a clock; whilst putting on morning cloathes, say the prayer for death, and the Te Deum: then, presently to my prayers, and soe either dress myselfe, or goe to Church prayers. In dressing, I must consider how little it signifyes to the saveing of my soule, and how foolish 'tis to be angry about a thing so unnecessary. Consider what our Saviour suffered,—O Lord, assist me!

"When I goe into the withdrawing roome, lett me consider what my calling is; to entertaine the ladys, not to talke foolishly to men, more

especially the king; lett me consider, if a traytor be hateful, she that betrayes the soule of one is much worse;—the danger, the sin of it. Then, without pretending to witt, how quiet and pleasant a thing it is to be silent; or, if I doe speake, that it be to the glory of God. —Lord, assist me!

“Att church, lett me mind in what place I am; what about to ask, even the salvation of my soule; to whome I speak,—to the God that made me, redeemed and sanctified me, and can yett cutt me off when he pleases,—O Lord, assist me!

“When I go to my Lady Falmouth's, I ought to take paines with her about her religion, or else I am not her friend; to shew example by calmness in dispute, in never speaking ill of any body to herr, butt excuseing them rather.

“Goe to the queene allwayes att nine, and then read that place concerning the drawing roome, and lett my man waite for me to bring me word before publique prayers begin. If I find she dines late, come downe, pray and read, namely, that concerning prayer; and think why I read, to benefitt my soule, pass my tyme well, and improve my understanding,—O Lord, assist me!

“Be sure still to read that for the drawing roome in the privy-chamber, or presence, or other place before prayers, and soe again into the drawing roome for an hour or soe; and then slipp to my chamber and divert myselfe in reading some pretty booke, because the queen does not require my waiteing; after this to supper, which must not be much if I have dined well: and att neither meale to eate above two dishes, because temperance is best both for soule and body; then goe upp to the queen, having before read and well thought of what you have written. Amen.

“Sett not up above halfe an hour after eleaven at most; and as you undress, repeate that prayer againe; but, before, consider that you are perhapps goeing to sleepe your last; being in bedd, repeate your hymne softly, ere you turne to sleepe.

“If I awake in the night, lett me say that (for which she had collected many excellent passages, as I find among her papers) psalm. —Lord, assist me!

“In the morning, wakeing, use a short devotion; and then, as soon as ever you awake, rise immediately to praise him. The Lord assist me!”

These admirable rules, framed by a young person living at a dissipated court, are enough to show how entirely her spirit was divorced from the thoughtless multitudes among whom she moved: and while doubtless there were many to envy her her high place, we are able to see the daily watchfulness and anxieties which that exaltation cost her; behind all the glitter and show of those royal scenes, we may detect the feet of this young girl treading as it were on ploughshares as she strove to walk with God. In another part of her diary we find the peculiar temptations to

which she was exposed in such a court still more pointedly alluded to.

"As to pleasure, she says, they are speaking of playes and laughing att devout people: well, I will laugh att myselfe for my impertinencies, that by degrees I may come to wonder why any body does like me; and divert the discourse; and talke of God and moralitie; avoid those people when I come into the drawing-roome, especially among great persons to divert them; because no raillery almost can be innocent; goe not to the Dutchess of Monmouth above once a weeke, except when wee dress to rehearse, and then carry a booke along with me to read when I dont act, and soe come away before supper.

"Talke little when you are there; if they speak of any body I cant commend, hold my peace, what jest soever they make; be sure never to talk to the king; when they speak filthyly, though I be laugh'd att, look grave, remembring that of Micha, there will a tyme come when the Lord will bind up his jewells. Never meddle with others business, nor hardly ask a question; talk not slightly of religion. If you speake any thing they like, say 'tis borrowed, and be humble when commended. Before I speake, Lord, assist me; when I pray, Lord, heare me; when I am praised, God, humble me; may the clock, the candle, every thing I see, instruct me; Lord, cleanse my hands, lett my feete tread thy pathes. Is any body laughed att, say it may be my case; is any in trouble, say, Lord, in justice I deserve it; but thou art all mercy; make me thankfull."

We see here the difficulties of her post, the dread of attracting the notice of the king, of being drawn into frivolous conversation with the courtiers, of even seeming to countenance ridicule of holy things which were habitually ridiculed, of letting her wit carry her away into a mode of discourse of which her conscience disapproved. We cannot but admire the judgment and good sense, as well as the piety, of the secret rules by which she tried to secure herself against the perils of her condition. It seems to have been her aim to avoid all charge of singularity, and yet not to yield even in appearance to the profane spirit that leavened the conversation of the court. She shrunk from any display of religiousness, and yet desired in such ways as became her youth and station boldly to keep her ground as a disciple of Christ. It is at all times difficult, to young persons especially, to mix Christian prudence with Christian zeal, not to do much or too little in the way of confession. Over-forwardness is as hurtful to the cause of truth as over-backwardness; and it requires no little skill to catch the middle current between rashness and cowardice. Margaret Blagge seems to have united in a singular degree the wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove; and

while with that reserve which earnestness inspires, she would not protrude her religious opinions, yet she showed herself not wanting in courage by refusing to laugh at the irreverent witticisms that flashed around her, by being silent and looking grave, and by bearing the ridicule which such modest piety was sure to provoke. We all know, even in our more reverent day, how much bravery it requires to be silent and wear a grave look when witty sayings tinged with irreverence are uttered in our presence by those who are older or higher in rank than ourselves. And, again, when the fear of God stirs up our courage, and we feel it sinful to seem to approve of a light way of speaking, we are apt to be indiscreet in our way of checking unseemly mirth.

But Margaret Blagge had not only to contend with the external temptations arising from her position at court; she had her own sources of trial seated in herself. Wit and beauty are not at any time easy possessions to use to the glory of God; they are just the qualities that make an instant glitter in the world; they give their owners much power of fascination; they tempt them to spread them out to catch admiration; and hence they often become like very swords cutting the soul off from God and giving it to the world. It is hard either to sheathe such powers or to be religious and serious in wielding them. We need not transport ourselves into the gay palaces of "the merrie monarch," to learn the danger of possessing wit and beauty. We see in these less dangerous times and in more ordinary positions how apt they are to minister to vanity and self-conceit, when there is no temptation whatever to break the rules of decency and outward propriety of life. Oftentimes when we see some little world dazzled by a fair face which is lighted up and still further beautified by a lively wit, we might well wish, for her own sake, that plain looks and a common-place understanding were the portion of the fair conqueror moving so proudly through the fields of victory. To be the idol of a little circle of devotees, to be gazed upon and listened to with marked delight, to draw up like the sun the dew and vapours of constant praise, to be the oracle and star of many admirers, is a sore trial to flesh and blood. And hence we so often behold women the most endowed with natural gifts frittering away their life in a ceaseless round of gaiety, without any serious business or any serious thought, treading a vain and frivolous round of selfish amusement, without any higher or nobler mark set before their souls than "to shine in society."

That Margaret Blagge had these gifts, Evelyn bears witness. "Wee will now then looke at her," he says, "as att Whitehall, whither she came from St. James to waite upon her majesty, after the death of the dutchess, when she was not above sixteen.

I had not then indeed the honour to know her; butt I have heard from others, that her beauty and her witt was soe extraordinary improved, as there had nothing been seene more surprizing and full of charmes; every body was in love with, and some almost dyeing for her." In another place, he says she was "looked upon as a little miracle; and indeed there were some addresses made of the greatest persons," and she had "the reputation of a witt, which made her the life of conversation and the pretty miracle at court." But all these natural powers of conversation and vivacity were under constant control; she felt their danger, and was practising continual severity upon herself, that she might not be transported in moments of excitement beyond the bounds of charity and religion. Amid all the desecration of wit around her, she was thus enabled, like Addison afterwards, to turn that keen instrument against vice and folly; and by a constant method of self-government she acquired such mastery over her intellectual gifts, that she attained a singular and happy art of giving a serious turn to her conversation, without appearing to drag in the subject of religion, in a forced unseasonable way.

"She was ever at that sprightfull age," says Evelyn, "severely careful how she might give the least countenance to that liberty which the gallants there doe usually assume of talking with less reserve; nor did this eclipse her pretty humour, which was cheerful and easy amongst those she thought worthy her conversation . . . for she ever mingled her freest entertainments with something which tended to serious, and did it in such manner, as allwayes left some impressions extraordinary, even upon those who came perhapps with inclinations to pervert the most harmless conversations; soe it was impossible for any to introduce a syllable which did not comply with the strictest rules of decency. She would often check the vivacity which was naturall, and perfectly became her, for feare of giving occasion to those who lay in waite to deceive."

And after Evelyn knew her, he declares that,

"Her conversation was a treat, and I began to admire her temperance, and tooke especial notice, that however wide or indifferent the subject of our discourse was among the rest, she would allwayes divert it to some religious conclusion; and soe temper and season her replies, as shew'd a gracious heart, and that she had a mind taken up with heavenly things."

In the advice she had once occasion to give, we see her own method of discipline.

"As to what wee say ourselves, wee must take care that wee talke not to be the wittiest in the company; to acquire praise to ourselves

above our neighbours. Wee may divert people, and be innocently merry; but then wee must not designe to praise ourselves, nor please ourselves in the thoughts of it, butt in some short and silent prayer, desire God to keep us low in our owne eyes, as 'Lord, make me poore in spirit, that I may inherit the kingdom of heaven.' "

As it was always her aim not to affect over-severity of religion, so she gave way, as far as she could, to what seemed the more harmless amusements of court. Thus, though she somewhat distrusted the effect of acting, yet she thought it best to take part in the private plays, which were so much the fashion of the court. Her wit and vivacity helped to make her a capital actress, and she seems to have been always called upon to fill the principal parts; she had all the qualifications of an actress.

"The tone of her voice," says Evelyn, "was soe suited to all the passions and figures either of reading or discourse, that there was nothing more charmeing than to heare her recite with such a spirit and judgment as the periods fell! 'Tis hardly to be imagined the talent she peculiarly had in repeating a comicall part, or acting it, when in a chearful humour. She would sing, and play, and act, and recite, and discourse prettyly and innocently a thousand harmeless and ingenious purposes to recreat old and melancholy persons, and divert the younger . . . soe that, as I noted, the greatest dutchesses and ladyes of the court sought her friendship and assistance upon any occasion of solemn pomp, masque, ball, or exterordinary appearance, because of a certaine peculiar fancy and address she had in suiteing, dressing, and continuing things of ornament, with universal approbation."

But as she felt herself in these amusements on questionable ground, she seems to have been more careful of the spirit which she carried into them; and, hence, to curb her wit on such occasions, she had "such perpetual apprehensions of God's omnipresence, that she industriously suppressed it. I could tell of some artificial helps she used, to keep her alwayes in mind of it: thus she would pin up some papers, as it were negligently, in places where she most frequently used to be, with some character in it, or halfe word, that signified to her some particular caution;" while, as regarded her companions, lest she should seem to be countenancing levity, "in all these compliances she was watchfull of opportunityes to instill something of vertue and religion, as well by her discourse as example, and in such a manner, as not only avoided the censure of impertinence and singularity, butt which more endeared her to them. What shall I say? She had all the pretty arts and innocent stratagems imaginable, of mingling serious things on all occasions, seasoning even her diversions with something of religion, which, as she would manage it, putt to rebuke all their stocks of rayllery."



It was doubtless this happy faculty of making "virtue and holyness a chearfull thing," that gave her an influence over her companions at court. Her lightness of heart and guileless hilarity gave a visible contradiction to those deceitful maxims of the world which represent religion as an austere and bitter taskmaster. As she had been "a young apostles planting religion in the barren soyle" of the household of the Duchess of York, so this young girl was soon able, in the still more "barren soyle" of King Charles's court, to cast some good seed in the stony places, and to see the fruit of labours that were carried on with as much of tact and discretion as of earnestness and zeal. All this was done without stepping from her place; she did not put herself forward in any prominent way.

Though she herself adhered to our own rule, that "wee should not preache in the withdrawing roome," yet

"Even in the court how many of the greatest there, were made to looke upon religion as a serious thing, yett consistent with their post. . . . There are yet some who owe their tincture to this lady, and will, I hope, retaine it. 'Twere easy to shew whom, by her counsell and address, she had rescued; some from fatal precipices in that giddy station; others whom she has instructed, that were ignorant and careless; some that she gained to a severe course, who were listning to folly and ruine; in a word, it was the pleasure of her life, and the business of the day, to cast about how she might improve it to those advantages."

But she who was guiding the feet of others felt her own need of help and encouragement in a path so difficult. Such a court was, after all, to such a spirit, little else than a crowded wilderness. She was indeed alone. Religious isolation is, at all times, a trial hard to bear. We want to unbosom ourselves, to give vent to our warmer thoughts; to put the cases of conscience that perplex us before friends who will enter into our perplexity; to be stirred up, in times of despondency, by their cheering words or example. If it is a trial to be dwelling with those who are simply uninterested in our religious views and struggles, what must it be to have our lot cast in a profane and irreverent world, which opposes or despises religion altogether? No wonder the lonely and anxious spirit of Margaret Blagge yearned for a religious friend. She had, indeed, been accustomed to consult the Dean of Hereford in any spiritual strait; but this intercourse seems to have been chiefly by letter, at that time a slow, and at all times an imperfect mode of intercourse. What she wanted, in addition to that excellent adviser, was one living closer to her, moving somewhat in the same scenes, to whom she could more constantly apply,—whose very presence would help to nerve and

steady her ; and who would be able, from actual sight and experience of her difficulties, to understand her needs. In this desire for friendship, she was instinctively drawn towards the good and gentle Evelyn. He was just that sort of character which was likely to attract a woman of strong religious feeling, who wanted to be patiently and considerately met in all her little straits and trials. But Evelyn had only seen the lighter side of her character. He had long been thrown into the same scenes, but he had only crossed her in her more sprightly moods. He had accordingly catalogued her with that herd of vain giddy women, who basked like summer-flies in the sunshine of a court. He found her to be "a very agreeable lady," but nothing more ; though his wife, in entertaining her at their "poore villa" of Sayes Court, "discovered such extraordinary charmes, markes of vertue and discretion," that she reproved his "infidelity ;" yet he confesses "he was brought to believe with soe much difficulty, that it was almost seaven yeares" before he could be "hectored out of his contracted humour ;" and he "fancied her some airy thing, that had more witt than discretion." Closer intercourse, however, brought him to confess his wife's discernment : he admits at last that "she might not be that pert lady" he had fancied ; and, as she was eager to obtain his friendship, that it might support her in her religious course, she took every occasion of contriving an intimacy. When his prejudice began, by frequent visits, to abate, "she conjured me," he says, "not to baulk her holy cell ; and I was not a little pleased to be soe solemnly diverted, and finde my selfe mistaken, that soe young, soe elegant, soe charming a witt and beauty should preserve soe much virtue in a place where it neither naturally grew nor much was cultivated ; for, with all these perfections, vivacitye and apprehension, beyond what I could expect, she seemed unconcerned and steady ; could endure to be serious, and gently reprove my moroseness, and was greatly devout ; which putt me out of all feare of her railary, and made me looke upon her with extraordinary respect." The more her real character began to unfold itself before him, the more we find him warming in his expressions of admiration ; till at last he exclaims, "What a new thing is this ! I think Paulina and Eustochius are come from Bethlehem to Whitehall ; and from this moment I began to looke on her as sacred, and to bless God for the graces which shoone in her. I dayly prayed for her, as she had enjoined me, and she began to open some of her holy thoughts to me ; and that she had totally resigned herself to God ; and with these incentives, who, that had any sence of religion, could forbear to vallue her exceedingly ?"

Margaret Blagge was now able to entreat Evelyn to become her guide and her adviser. "I would have a friend," she said to Evelyn: "in that name is a great deale more than I can express." And when Evelyn began, in the courteous language of the day, to express the honour which her friendship would confer, she bid him "leave his complimenting, and be her friend, and looke upon her as his child." Quite characteristic of the age was the formal method in which the friendship was sealed; "there standing," says Evelyn, "pen and ink upon the table, in which I had been drawing something upon a paper like an alter, she writt these words: 'Be this the symbol of inviolable friendship, Mary Blagge, 16th October, 1672;' and underneath, 'For my brother E . . . .;' and soe delivered it with a smile." "'Tis certaine," is the exclamation of the warm-hearted and excellent Evelyn, "I no more looked upon her as Mrs. Blagge, but as my child indeed."

Evelyn kept his word. He became a staff on which she could lean in all her spiritual needs; and though he continued to encourage her in corresponding with "that reverend and learned divine," the Dean of Hereford, in all times of difficulty, he became on all ordinary occasions "the depositarie of her pious thoughts and resolutions;" and, being ever at hand, was able to advise and sympathise with her in all the daily trials of her faith. As this friendship gave him a decided insight into her character and mode of life, we have the advantage of gazing at a picture drawn from life, and of seeing her in a variety of natural attitudes, as they were observed and caught by her friendly painter. By this means we learn the methods by which she was enabled to live so much above the world, in scenes where the world was fluttering before her with all manner of fascinations. We cannot resist laying before our readers some of the details of her holy life, as it is not enough to gaze at the great outlines of an exalted character—to take a rough view of its vast proportions; it is useful to draw near, to examine it more closely and in detail; to search into the manner of its growth; to learn how it throve and waxed so strong; for it is by going into these particulars, by learning the rules and modes of management which were used, that we gain real instruction for our own progress in spiritual life. We avoid wasting our time in experiments—in visionary and untried methods of self-control.

Beginning with her Sundays, it is thus Evelyn draws what he calls "the picture" of her life.

"Were it never soe dark, wett, or uncomfortable weather, dureing the severity of winter, she would rarely omit being att the chapel att seven a'clock prayers, and if a communion day, how late soever her

attendance were on the queen, and her own extraordinary preparation kept her up, she would be dressed and attend her private devotions some hours before the publick office begun."

This leads him to narrate an amusing stratagem by which she secured her early rising, a matter to some constitutions of daily difficulty.

"Finding one day a long pack thread passing through the key-hole of her chamber doore, and reaching to her bed's head, and inquiring what it signified, I at last understood, it had been to awaken her early in the morning, the centinell, whose station was of course near the entrance, being desired to pull it very hard at such an hour, whilst the other extrem was tyed fast about her wrist, fearing her maid might oversleep herself, or call her later than she had appointed."

There are, we believe, a variety of ingenious machines and contrivances in vogue for the encouragement of early rising; and where, as was the case with Dr. Arnold, it is a constant effort to get up, we cannot but recommend any such tricks as these. As general indolence is clearly the common fault and temptation of the women of the higher classes, so it is no trifling matter to gain a victory early in the day. Beat indolence at cock-crow, and we may continue to triumph through the day. Where there seems to be almost a superfluity of time, and it hangs upon the hands like waste goods, and the day is not marked out into compartments of duty, and there seems nothing particular to do but to write notes, or read novels, or make calls, or deliberate with milliners, then of course there appears no reason for early rising. But must not there be something fearfully wrong when there is not a well-arranged mode of life, when no positive course of action is marked out, when we do not see duties, or when we wait till they come to our door and ask us to do them; and when without any definite object of existence we idle away the day in selfish littlenesses? We know it is easy to talk boldly of early rising overnight, while we are sitting with all our faculties alert by our evening fire; we know that the snug warmth of the morning counterpane is apt to thaw the stoutest resolutions, and arguments the most irresistible are apt to become limp and unstarched as we lie in a sort of drowsy felicity; but still, without letting the reader into our own practices, we do heartily recommend all sorts of stratagems to those who cannot otherwise conquer a lazy spirit.

But, to return from this by-lane into which we have been tempted to turn aside:—

"Besides the monthly Communions, she rarely missed a Sunday

throughout the whole year, wherein she did not receive the Holy Sacrament, if she were in towne and tollerable health ; and I well know she had those who gave her constant advertisement where it was celebrated upon some more solemn festivals, besides not seldom on the weeke days assisting at one poor creature's or others ; and when sometimes being in the country or in a journey, she had not those oppertunityes she made use of a devout meditation upon that sacred mistery, by way of mental communion ; and O with what unspeakable care and niceness did she use to dress and trim her soul against this heavenly banquet, with what flagrant devotion at the altar. I have seen her receive the holy symbolles, with such an humble and melting joy in her countenance as seemed to be something of transport, not to say angelic—something I cannot describe.

“ How would this lady rejoyce att the approach of the Lord's day. She has often told me, she felte another soule in her, and that there was nothing more afflicted her, than those impertinent visitts on Sunday evenings, which she avoided with all imaginable industry ; whilst seldome did she pass one without goeing to visitt, pray by, or instruct some poore religious creature or other, tho' it were to the remotest part of the towne . . . In a word, she was alwayes soe solemnly chearfull upon that day, and soe devout, that without looking into the kalender, one might read it in her countenance.

“ Upon festivall days, she never omitted the offices of the Church ; takeing those oppertunityes of visiting poore sick people, relieving and comforting them ; and then would lengthen her evening retirements with proper meditations on the mistery, or commemoration ; for which she had of her owne collection apposite entertainments . . . How extraordinary were her recesses and devotions on every Friday, when she rarely stirred out of her little oratorye butt to publique prayers, and then would end the evenings in visitts of charity ; and did observe the Lent with strictness, till finding it much impaire her health and delicate constitution, something of those severe mortifications she was persuaded to abate ; only the holy weeke her exercises were extended to all the parts of duty, and more solemn preparation, spent in an uninterrupted course of penitentiall and extraordinary devotion, yett without superstitious usages or the least moroseness.

“ Upon such anniversaryes, she would be early att the chappell ; and sometimes I have known her shut upp in the church after the publick offices have been ended, without returning to her chamber att all, to prevent impertinent visitts and avocations.

“ Thus spent she the Sunday, feasts, or fasts ; nor were the extraordinary weeke dayes other than Sundays with her, when none came to interrupt her course . . . Noe sooner was she descended from her bed, but she fell on her knees in profound adoration ; and all the tyme of her dressinge, her mayd was reading some part of Scripture to her, and when her assistance was necessary, she would take the booke herselfe, and read to her maid . . . She withdrew to private devotion in her closet till her servant advertysed her it was time to goe to chappell . . .

Nor did her forenoone devotion determine here; she not seldom might be found in the chappell at ten a'clock in the longer office. Nay, and I have sometimes mett her above in his majistyes little oratorye before dinner, if conveniently she could slipp away from the mixt company of the withdrawing roome, whilst the queen sat out; and this she did, not out of singularity or superstitious devotion, or that she thought herself obliged to it, butt (as she has told me) to avoid occasions of idle and impertinent discourse, which was almost unavoidable in the antechambers."

Now though these extracts chiefly exhibit the devotional side of her character, and show her diligent use of the ordinances of the Church, yet we must not overlook the marks of active piety which peep out. Hers was no mere sighing of the soul towards heaven. She worked as well as prayed. She indulged not merely in what have well been called "the luxuries of religion." She did not gaze with pleased eyes at the flowers in the garden of faith, but she dug in the garden and did the rougher work. When removed from the excitements of the world, with nothing but sounds and sights to revive or prolong religious feeling at every turn, with feet moving continually to the House of God, and with solemn services ever rekindling the flame of faith, we may attain a sort of inactive, untried, and, as it is technically called, "contemplative piety." But this is not, for a moment, to be compared with that vigorous energetic faith which stands the blustering atmosphere of the world, which lives through the scenes of varying temptation, which works, as it were, out of doors, and is weather-proof. Many, whose religion, shut out and screened from the rougher winds of the world, might continue to live like a hot-house plant in a place attuned to its tender condition, would fail in a course of active, busy, laborious piety. The practical Christian, indeed, contains within himself the best parts of the contemplative. He must be devotional; he cannot work except he strengthens himself by a regular course of devotion. As we have seen in the case of Margaret Blagge, she was no mere "practical person" in the worse sense of the word, no despiser of prayer; but she kept the proportion of faith; she divided her time aright; she did not suffer either the practical duties of the Gospel or its devotional acquirements to have a monopoly. Her oars were not all on one side, but ranged evenly on both. It has been one of the bright characteristics of the saints of the English Church, as we took occasion not only to assert but to prove, in our former remarks on the churchwomen of the seventeenth century, that they have combined, in a singular degree, the devotional with the practical life; and it is this combination which we are bound especially to insist upon, when we are raising a stand-



ard or a mark to strike at. Margaret Blagge, we repeat, is a fresh and happy illustration of the combination we speak of; she was winged on both sides; and it was by her prayers and her practice that she flew so high towards perfection. We have already seen—that besides her observance of daily prayer, “of fasts, festivals, of Holy Communions, private reading and meditation,” she was wont to “visit, pray by, or instruct some poor religious creature or other;” but Evelyn gives us ampler records of her active and positive charity:—

“She was alwayes,” he says, “doeing some good offices for one or other; gave frequent and considerable reliefe to poore and indigent people, and not seldome made me her almoner, and the hand to convey it where she could not well herselfe; butt of this and the many visitts she, in her own person, made (delicate as she was), to refresh and comfort the sick and miserable, even amongst the most wretchedly poore; nott without great inconveniencye to her health, I shall give account hereafter.”

We are reminded of that excellent saying, once uttered in our presence by a frail and delicate woman, who was inclined to over-tax her strength in the cause of religion, “It is better to wear than to rust.” And all this, observes her admiring and humble biographer:—

“Being yett hardly enter'd her nineteenth yeare, an age that few, in her circumstances, soe soone sett out att, and would that I begun as early, and as early finished.”

He speaks of her also as—

“Employing most part of Lent in workeing for poore people, cutting out and makeing waistcoates and other necessary coverings, which she constantly distributed among them, like another Dorcas, spending much of her tyme, and no little of her money, in relieving, visitting, and enquireing of them out.” “I have already told,” he continues, “how diligently she would inquire out the poore and miserable, even in hospitals, humble cells and cottages, whither I have often accompanied her, as farr as the very skirts and obscure places of the towne, among whom she not only gave liberall almes, but physitians and physick she would send to some, yea, and administer remedies herselfe, and the meanest offices. She would sit and read, and instruct, and pray whole afternoones, and tooke care for their spiritual reliefe by procureing a minister of religion to prepare them for the holy sacrament, for which purpose she not only carry'd and gave them bookes of salvation and devotion, but had herselfe collected diverse psalmes and chapters proper to be read and used upon such occasions.”

Then he goes on to speak of the number she relieved,—

“No fewer than twenty-three, whom she cladd at one time,” and she

employed a poor widow, "to informe her of sick and miserable people, who accompanied her to their habitations, and brought them cloutes, money, and medicines . . . by her she distributed weekly pensions, looked after orphan children, putt them to schoole, visited the prisons," "paid rent for indigent housekeepers," put forth apprentices, "visited and released prisoners, of which I thinke I can produce a list of above thirty restrained for debt," and he has often "knowne her slipp away and breake from the gay and publique company to make a stepp to some miserable poore creature, whilst those she quitted have wondered why she went from the conversation; and more they would, had they seen how the scene was changed from a kingly palace to some meane cottage, from the company of princes to poore necessitous wretches, when by and by she would returne as chearfull and in good humour, as if she had been about some worldly concerne, and excuse her absence in the most innocent manner imaginable."

And when she had lost at cards, "a diversion which she affected not, but to comply with others, when sometymes she could not avoid it;" we find the following extract in her diary:—

"June the 2nd.—I will never play this halfe year but att 3 penny omber, and then with one att halves. I will nott; I doe not vow, but I will not doe it,—what, loose money at cards, yett not give the poore? 'Tis robbing God, misspending tyme and misemploying my talent; three great sins. Three pounds would have kept three people from starveing a month: well, I will not play."

Cards have ceased to be an expensive toy of the women of the age; but might not this passage suggest some curtailing of personal expenses in the way of over-much dress, variety of dress, trinkets, ornaments, and other costly trifles, that swallow so much of their personal means? Might not a hint be taken from the words, "*Three pounds would have kept three people from starveing a month?*" How many "three pounds" are wasted on the mere caprices of extravagance, on the changeable humours of self-indulgence, on useless luxuries that please only for a day. How excellent a system, at least, to tithe the pin-money, or the allowance, to reserve it at once for "pious and charitable uses."

But while we are initiated into the mode of life of this admirable person, we feel inclined every moment to stop and ask ourselves, whether she can really have formed a part of the court of Charles II.? whether our eyes read aright, and our senses play us true? Truly, with such marked and strong confession of Christ in such a "Cæsar's palace," we are convinced at once that there are no circumstances in which a strong confession may not be made. Those who shrink from any thing like a decided course in religion, are always apt to accuse their "circumstances;" we know no such scapegoat as that vague something,

“our circumstances;” on “our circumstances” are heaped half our delinquencies and neglects; if we were not just in this difficult position, we say, if we were any where but where we are, we should be different. Here we have an instance of a mere girl, who, instead of yielding with a supple mind to the strong current of worldliness and vice, on which her boat was launched, breasted the tide with a resolute and determined heart, and was a most pious earnest member of the Church under circumstances not likely in our day to be repeated. Again, while we see this devout and gentle character moving through the splendid chambers of a court, we seem to discern the design of Providence in not separating the wheat from the chaff in this present world, but in mixing them together, that no place may be without its faithful witnesses or its good leaven. It is, of course, natural for a serious mind to withdraw into circles where serious minds alone are to be found; there is an oppressive sense of spiritual loneliness when such a spirit is forced to breathe in an uncongenial atmosphere. But, though it is a trial to continue mixing with worldly and thoughtless minds, yet we may often see the value of the trial to both parties; it is often a good matter, that the desire for retreating into religious societies cannot be indulged; the hindrance is a providence. How much more worldly would the world become, if it were possible for the serious portion to separate itself into exclusive fellowships! What would it be if the serious mother, or wife, or daughter, of a worldly family, were to withdraw into a religious house, and the serious officer to withdraw from his regiment, and the serious barrister from the courts of law! The worldly family, the army, the office, the courts of law, would wax worse and worse. What we want is to have witnesses every where, in every calling, in every grade; we want the good leaven to be diffused through the lump, not abstracted. We want Christian duchesses, Christian gentlewomen, Christian officers, Christian lawyers, living in their own natural sphere, acting upon the bodies among whom they naturally move, and continuing in their position, as though they felt it to be providential, and had there to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour. Without designing to encourage any fanciful dreams of conversion, we must yet state our conviction that many a family has been changed by the quiet, unostentatious, and consistent piety of but a single member. There is something “catching”—if we may use so loose a phrase—in virtue as well as in vice; and we are disposed, instead of ranging the world into two sides, to keep our earnest members in every part, in “court and camp,” that they may act as missionaries in the very strongholds of the world.

But we must not be supposed from these remarks to be opposing religious houses for women ; on the contrary, we are ready to stand forth as advocates for their establishment, provided the design be carefully commenced and carried out. We think the English Church not only capable of throwing out such institutions, but greatly needing them, and greatly to be benefited by them. Indeed, we think the time ripe for efforts in this direction. But what we mean is this, that such colleges should be composed of persons in isolated circumstances, whose families are broken up, or dead, or scattered abroad, who have outlived their kindred, or live without near connexion ; we do not wish to see those withdrawn from their homes who have real duties there, that they may escape the trials which their duties bring. We would rather gather together the lonely and forlorn, the detached fragments that are scattered in useless nooks here and there, and then work them up into good useful fellowships, giving them objects, duties, sympathies, opportunities of good. There is a great deal of waste material packed up and lying like lumber in our large towns, that only wants to be drawn forth and set in motion. How many women there are, who, confined by moderate means in a state of dull and profitless seclusion, waste their affections on lap-dogs, cats, and parrots, and have no wider range of thought and action than the manufacture of screens and pin-cushions. We grieve to think of the misdirected kindness that is continually taking a narrower and narrower round, and of the insipid mechanical routine of frivolous occupations, hardly to be called " life," which many isolated women go through. Could they not be turned to some account ? Could they not be drawn from their lonely firesides, and formed into useful sisterhoods, where their sympathies might no more be suffered to rust or to contract ; where means of doing good might be put in their way ; where, besides the benefit of social and friendly life within the walls of their house, and besides many internal helps to religion, they might be invited to become visitors of the sick and poor, or of the children at our schools. We should like to see the foundation of some such religious house, in which the unwarrantable and dangerous principle of " vows " should be dispensed with, the doctrine and practices of the English Church firmly and temperately adopted, all young unsteady spirits that are taken merely with the romantic or picturesque view of nunneries carefully shut out. We believe that such a " Sisterhood of Charity " would be a great boon to many lonely women, and a great blessing to the Church, especially if discretion were the helpmate of zeal in the first experiment.

But to return to Margaret Blagge. As the court of Charles II.

was a place of no ordinary trial, so it was not desirable that a spirit so anxious for salvation should be kept too long upon the stretch. After having thus braved that "perilous climate," and having thus turned many to righteousness, she began to think she had run through her term of probation. We must not omit to mention that an early attachment formed with Mr. Godolphin had doubtless been among the means of steadying her in her difficult position; indeed she confesses as much herself. "Being soone sencible of love myselfe," she says, "I was easily perswaded to keepe myselfe from giveing him any cause of jealousye, and in so long time never has there been the least. This, under God's providence, has been the means of preserveing me from many of those misfortunes young creatures meet with in the world, and in a court espetially." But she now thought her apprenticeship at court had been fully served. "Seaven yeares," she said, "was enough and too much," to endure so fiery a trial of her soul, and accordingly, she made her intention of quitting it, known to her excellent guide. Her next step was to request permission to resign her post; and this she did in Evelyn's presence, doubtless with a view of supporting herself by his countenance in making her suit to the queen. He gives us a description of the scene:—

"I happened to be with her in the queen's withdrawing-roome, when a day or two after finding her oppertunity, and that there was less company, she begg'd leave of their majestyes to retire; never shall I forgett the humble and becomeing address she made, nor the joy that discovered itselfe in this angell's countenance, above anything I had ever observ'd of transport in her, when she had obtained her suite . . . She tooke, I assure you, her leave of their majestyes with soe much modesty and good a grace, that tho' they look't as if they would have a little reproach't her for makeing soe much hast, they could not find in their hearts to say an unkind word to her; butt there was for all that I am certaine something att the heart like grieve; and I leave you to imagine how the rest of the court mourn'd this recess, and how dim the tapers burnt as she pass'd the antichamber. . . . Itt was, I remember, on a Sunday night, after most of the company were departed, that I waited on her downe to her chamber, where she was no sooner entered, butt falling on her knees she bless'd God as for a signall deliverance."

She now took up her abode at Berkeley House, the residence of Sir John, afterwards Lord Berkeley of Stratton, where she "consecrated her new oratorye," and was bent on having her own little place of retirement in the midst of it, where she might "have noe body to observe butt God, be mistresse of her houres, and govern her affaires suitable to her devout inclinations." Finding, however, even here, that she could not live in the complete seclusion she desired, but was interrupted "by the necessity of compliance

with the lady of the family, the continuall and importune visits of great persons, obligeing her to tedious ceremony and conversation, she resolved upon altogether retireing from the world," and "under the guidance of the Dean of Hereford, who had long been her spiritual father," leading a single life. These resolves she communicated to her friend, who combated them with friendly warmth. He was unwilling that such a light should burn only for itself in a lonely chamber. He saw how great a sphere of duty she was neglecting, for which she was so admirably fitted, and was loth to let one retreat as it were to a spiritual wilderness, who, as the mistress of a household, might mould and guide so many souls into the way of peace. He saw "no monasteryes and pious recesses" into which she could retreat, and he plainly felt sincere compassion for Mr. Godolphin, from whom "after nine yeares" engagement, it seemed any thing but a duty to break, since God could be served in married as in single life. "The trueth is," he says, "I did heartyly pity that worthy gentleman, and saw noe reason in the world why they should not both be happy in each other." It was at this period that she made frequent visits to Evelyn at Sayes Court, where he tried to avert the shadows of despondency that seemed gathering over her spirit. Probably the reaction from so strained a state of soul as the perils of court-life forced her to preserve, occasioned a certain degree of melancholy. We cannot refrain from giving the arguments wherewith Evelyn sought to remove the desires for a single life, which seem then to have possessed her with some force:—

"I consented," he says, "to all her elogies of the virgin state, butt there was no less due to the conjugall; and that if there were some temptations in it, her meritts would be the greater, and the exercise of her virtue; circled indeed it was with some tolerable thornes, but rewarded with illustrious coronetts for the good it produced; that as to the oppertunityes of serveing God, an active life was preferable to the contemplative; . . . and when St. Paul exalted the celibate above it (the married life), for the advantages he enumerates, it was not to derogate from marriage, butt because of the present distress and the impediments of a family to an itinerant and persecuted apostle, and those who in that conjuncture had noe certaine abode. That as to the perfection and puritie of the state, it was one thing to be married to a man, another to a husband; to the first indeed, most of the world were join'd, to the second none butt the religious. . . . That the fidelity, society, mutuall affection, and instance of religious marriages, the regularity of their charitye, and hospitalitie of their families, was emulous of the highest pretences of the virgin and more solitary condition. Doe you (would I say) esteeme it noe honour to have given saints to the Church, and useful members to the state in which you live; and that you can be hospitable to strangers, institute your children, give instruc-



tion to your servants, example to your neighbours, and be parent of a thousand other blessings? . . . I plainly told her it was by no means agreeable to her piety, nor to the equitye of the thing, that any less consideration than a foresight of inevitable ruine should suspend her resolutions of giving herself to a deserveing person, whose approaches had been soe honourable, and whome she confess'd she lov'd above all the world. There is nothing certainly more calamitous than where love (as they call it) drives the bargain, and passion blinds the man : but soe the young things precipitate and the giddy are entangled, and when the fancye cools, repentance succeeds, and it ends in aversion and anxietye. But these calentures concern'd not this excellent couple. . . . I applauded her recourse to assiduous and humble prayer, that God would direct her for the best, and that after all I said and written to her, she would make that her oracle; being confident that God, who had hitherto taken such signall care of her, would not suffer her to miscarry in this concerne."

But while she was in "this doubtful and uncertain condition," she was once more called back to the court, at the king's command, to take part in a play; "wherein none were to be actors butt persons of the most illustrious quality; the Lady Mary, since Princess of Orange, the Duchess of Monmouth, and all the shineing beautyes." The loyalist notions of those times forbad her to refuse; but the compliance cost her, we are told, "many teares." "Dear friends," she writes to Evelyn, "I begg your prayers in this cloudy weather, that God would endow me with patience and resignation. Would you believe itt, there are some who envy me the honour (as they esteem it) of acting in this play, and pass malicious jests upon me. Now, you know I am to turne the other cheeke, nor take I notice of itt." She had to take a principal part in the play, and was so adorned, that she wore "near twenty thousand pounds value of jewells;" but "amid all this pomp and serious impertinence, whilst the rest were acting, and that her part was sometymes to goe off, as the scenes required, into the tireing roome, where severall ladies, her companions, were railling with the gallants trifleingly enough till they were called to reenter; she, under pretence of conneing her next part, was retired into a corner, reading a booke of devotion, without att all concerning herselfe or mingling with the young company; as if she had no farther part to act, who was the principall person of the comedy; nor this with the least discernible affectation, butt to divert and take off her thoughts from the present vanity." Her acting was excellent; she trode the stage "with a surpriseing and admirable aire," and drew forth the admiration of the court: but, no sooner had the curtain dropped; than "without complimenting any creature, or trifling with the rest; who staid the collation and refreshment that was prepared,

away she skips, like a spiritt, to Berkley house, and to her little oratorye." Evelyn following her thither, found her on her knees, "thanking God that she was delivered from this vanity, and with her Saviour againe; never, says she, will I come within this temptation more whilst I breath."

Hitherto we have been following this saintly woman in her victories over herself and her world; but, that we may be assured we have been tracing the real route of a real conqueror of the world, and have been dealing with real flesh and blood, her truthful biographer, as an exact painter, has not brushed past the blemishes of his friend, nor hung any skilful drapery over the weaker portions of her life. The exposure of her defects convinces us, that he has not overcharged her with perfections in the other parts of his accounts, especially when the transaction he reveals was one which gave him personally peculiar pain, and touched him to the quick. We have already shown the zeal with which Evelyn advised his friend to end her nine years' engagement with marriage; a zeal which involved him in long and frequent communications. We may judge, therefore, of his pain, when, for the first time, the compact of friendship so seriously made and so long revered, was broken asunder. She was secretly married to Mr. Godolphin at the Temple Church; and, to add to great unkindness an actual sin, she continued to feign herself unmarried before Evelyn. The reason either of the secrecy, or the prevarication, does not appear. There were none present but Lady Berkeley, and the maid of the bride; indeed, so long was the secret kept, not only from the world, but from Evelyn, that she accompanied Lady Berkeley to Paris, at which court Lord Berkeley was appointed ambassador; and it was not till she returned home that she confessed her marriage. During her stay in France, she lived in the greatest retirement, and "nott soe much as once appeared att court all the tyme of her being att the ambassador's house: and, tho' the report of such a beauty and witt had so forerun her arrivall, that the French king was desirous to see her in that att Saint Germaines; yet she soe ordered matters as to avoid all occasions of goeing thither, and came back to England without giveing that great monarch the satisfaction of one glaunce." She had, of course, put herself into a delicate position; and it would have been doubtless painful to her, to have appeared publicly and continually at court as an unmarried person, especially, as Evelyn takes care to inform us, that in that court "the vertues of strangers did not allwayes protect the sex from inconveniencies."

She seems to have even avoided seeing what we call 'the sights'

of Paris, if we except "a cloyster of nuns, whose manner of liveing did not displease her, whilst nothing of their superstition could endanger one soe well principled in her religion." Her remarks upon nunneries are sensible. "Since I came to Paris, she says, I have hardly been out of doores to visitt any body, butt there has been a priest to visitt me; butt, without vanity, I think I said as much for my opinion as he did for his . . . soe as you need have no fear of me on that side. God knows the more one sees of their Church, the more one finds to dislike in itt; I did not imagine the tenth part of the superstition I find in it, yett still could approve of their orders. Their nunneryes seem to be holy institutions; if they are abused, 'tis not their fault; what is not perverted?"

She seems never indeed to have breathed the faintest sigh nor cast one wistful look of love towards Rome. She found her lot cast in the English Church; there she stayed, not only with content, but thankfulness; there she found all the nourishment essential to the soul. If ever her heart had beaten with any desires for Rome, it would have been before her visit to France; for if the influence of example could have swayed her mind in the choice of a Church, the life of Charles's injured and unhappy queen would have long before drawn her to adopt the principles which her royal mistress so consistently and modestly maintained. But even then, when Romish practice in that particular instance was shaming Anglican principles, she wisely refused to judge of the English Church by her unworthy sons in a cloudy age, or to accept the corrupt doctrines of the Church of Rome, because a portion of her members, fed by the truths which she retains amid the dross, rose above the average height.

Untainted therefore by the religious atmosphere of France, right glad was Mrs. Godolphin, for so must we now call her, to escape the tediousness of what was splendid exile. On her return Evelyn was quickly at her side; the secret of her marriage was of course divulged; and while her well-tried friend, who had been really grieved, "she should soe industriously conceale a thing from one to whom she had along communicated her most intimate thoughts," gently reproved her for her fault; she seems to have confessed it with so much hearty sorrow as quickly to have quenched his mild displeasure. We find her accordingly a frequent guest at that good specimen of a quiet, godly, cheerful English home, Sayes Court. On Lord Berkeley's return from France she took up her residence in what Evelyn calls that "pretty habitation" which had been built for her in Scotland Yard, "settling with that pretty and discreete economye so naturall to her; and never was there such an household of faith,

never lady more worthy of the blessings she was entering into, who was soe thankfull to God for them."

Evelyn soon saw that he had no reason to regret his commendations of marriage, or his advice to his friend on that subject. All his hopes of her usefulness, and all his notions of her fitness for a post so responsible as that of mistress of a household, were fully realized. With evident joy he declares that, "she was none of those who would have excused her coming to the divine and royall feasts, because she had married an husband; slacking in nothing of her former zeale and labours of love, without the least impeachment to her domestick charge. Soe dextrously she knew to reconcile both these duties, that I believe there never was family more an household of faith." She instantly gave herself to the care and improvement of her servants; she entered upon this part of her duty with pious heartiness, not considering them as the mere living furniture or breathing machinery of her house, to be fed well and paid honestly that they might do with skill their round of work, but as a spiritual charge entrusted to her by God for a spiritual end. The engagement between herself and those under her, she was loth to look upon as a cold compact that turned only upon work and pay. She had far warmer feelings and warmer interest in her dependents; and, accordingly, in her eager love for their growth in godliness, "she provided them bookes to read, prayers to use by themselves, and constantly instructed them herself in the principles of religion; tooke care for their due receiveing of the holy sacrament." How soon the mere mechanical respect which modern servants are apt to pay, might be changed into warmer reverence and regard, if modern mistresses would but warm towards their servants. But while Mrs. Godolphin was thus ruling her household in the fear of God, she was not a whit the less active in caring for her poorer brethren abroad. She continued to be a visitor of the sick, and a bountiful helper of the poor. And this is a point much to be regarded by the mistresses of families in these times; they are not, to use Bishop Andrewes' quaint expression, to "tread inwards," that is, to confine their energies within the circle of home life. Charity should doubtless begin at home, but not end there; and while children and servants claim the first place in their regard, they should so economize their time as not to neglect their duties abroad.

Happily passed the useful days of Mrs. Godolphin's married life. She had but one wish, that she might be "the mother of a child." At the end of two years this wish was granted; and two days after receiving the holy communion, which she took to pre-

nt "all possible surprizes," and to strengthen her in "the constant she was to enter upon," she gave birth to a boy. She seems to have had long before some sort of presentiment of her death. On one occasion she had seriously told Evelyn she should die before him; and on his visiting her a short time before her confinement, she confessed to a "more than ordinary impulse that she could not outlive the happiness she had so long wished for." At first there seemed nothing but reasons for thankfulness for the preservation of her life; and she continued in a "faire and happy condition," till after the baptism of her child. Evelyn and his wife were present at the baptism, and returned home full of joy and satisfaction; but on the Sunday following they were startled out of their joy by the news which Mr. Godolphin sent of his wife's alarming illness. "My poore wife," he writes, "is fallen very ill of a fever, with lightness in her head. You know how sayes the prayers of the faithfull shall save the sick; I humbly begg your charitable prayers for this poore creature and our distracted servant." Evelyn and his wife, true friends in the hour of adversity, hastened to the scene of distress, and found the illness increasing fast. Evelyn instantly bestirred himself to get the best medical aid; but this, strange to say, was not easily to be had. The occasion gives us a curious and unhappy insight into the condition of the medical world of that day, and makes us fleet with pride on the tenderness and vigilant humanity which are the noble characteristics of the profession at this present time. Mrs. Evelyn seems, and probably with reason, to have trusted the physician that was at first employed, and "thought it advisable to call an experienc'd person in cases of this nature." But it was so very long ere the doctor could be found, and so late ere he came, that through the frequency and violence of the fits, which were now delirious, her spiritts were soe far wasted, that tho' he were of the same opinion, and that something was omitted, yett would he by no intreaty be perswaded to apply any thing but in conjunction with other phisityans." Evelyn himself sallied out in search of further aid; but he says, "Itt being late in the night, itt was with extraordinary difficulty that I gott my ancient dear and religious friend, Dr. Needham, since with God, and then but valetudinarye himselfe, to come. Others who were sent for, wearyed as they pretended with toyle would not be prevailed with to rise, except Doctor Short; soe as till now, there had been little attempted." Time in such a case was every thing; and we can only wonder at the heartless selfishness of those who at a little fatigue stand in the way of saving life. When aid came it was too late. She languished till the next day; and then, with the most ardent prayers and offices of the holy man, who

continually attended," and the not less ardent prayers of her most faithful friends, to aid her on her passage, she breathed away her soul, and her spirit rose, we trust, into the regions of a better world. She died in her twenty-fifth year, young in age, and ripe in grace, in the very bloom of life, in the maturity of faith. Her husband, who rose to great honours in the state, lived and died a widower. He had but one wife, for he could find but one Margaret Godolphin.

We incline to let the curtain drop here, and not weaken the effect which even these gleanings of such a biography may be hoped to work, by any reflections of our own. The fate which in our youth awaited "*the moral*" which was always appended to "*Æsop's Fables*" might well warn us of the inutility of adding any such conclusions to tales that speak for themselves. Least of all are we disposed to say any thing of a controversial kind, after surveying so sublime a character that belongs to the Church at large, that is an example to all who bear the name of Christ, and desire to see the power of a living faith. We might well dispense with controversy for a time, and refresh our eyes with gazing at features that seem to look down upon all the littlenesses, and heats, and feuds, that surround us here on earth, and to lift us above the wrangling spirit of the world by their own heavenliness. And yet, after looking upon a form so beautiful, we must point to the means which were used to attain that combination of spiritual charms; we must remind our female readers that it was by an early and faithful use of the ordinances of the English Church, that Margaret Godolphin became the saint she was. She was a daughter of our Church, a light of that Divine system, which, by God's grace, has been continued amongst us to this day—nay, which is now rising into fresh vigour, by the energy of renewed and quickened life. Since Mrs. Godolphin's time the Church, so to speak, swooned away; now it is fast recovering from the swoon. We have in our generation to bear some of the evils of recovery of health, some irregularity of action, some heats and flushings, some uneven flutterings of heart, that are commonly the accompaniments of returning health. At such a time the influence of women, while it is great, is also critical. It becomes them especially to throw themselves into a course of sober piety, to resist fashions in religion, and new modes and new theories. To assist them in such steadfastness and sobriety, and yet to encourage their naturally enthusiastic temperament in a course of practical and lofty zeal, such a biography as that of Mrs. Godolphin's will be of the highest use. It will take them away from controversy; it will show them a high standard of excellence in their own Church; it will suggest duties; it will



direct them in the mode and extent of their devotion ; it will open a field of usefulness, whatever their circumstances may be. We know not how many of those ardent minds, who, in the midst of the excitement attending a state of transition from great lukewarmness to great thoughtfulness, allowed themselves to be carried from the safe borders of their own Church, might have been stayed, if, in the moment of their overwrought and morbid feeling, when they were unable to judge calmly, they had had sober-minded, staunch, yet earnest sisters, wives, or mothers at their sides, showing in a course of active, consistent, judicious piety, the grace which does flow in the English Church.

And not only must we consider the value of sober, yet warm-hearted women in the difficulties of controversial times, but we must consider their value as a means of staying that other and very opposite current of evil which runs strongly at this time ; we mean the current of worldliness, vanity, self-indulgence, luxuriousness, and frivolity. Margaret Godolphin shows us the power a mere girl may have in winning souls, provided she enters upon her work in no Quixotic or indiscreet or forward spirit, but in that calm, noiseless, deep, and earnest way, which betokens deeply-rooted principles. Might not many a worldly family be leavened by the women of the house ? might not many a father, or husband, or brother, be won by the conversation of the wife, or the sister, or daughter ? That the female members of the English Church may not be wanting in high-minded zeal, in self-denying devotion, in soberness and moderation, in these anxious yet hopeful times, is our earnest hope and our earnest prayer ! May many Margaret Godolphins be raised amongst us to the glory of God, and the edification of the Church !

---

**ART. VII.—1.** *A Reply to Lord John Russell's Letter to the Remonstrance of the Bishops against the Appointment of the Rev. Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford. By the Right Rev. HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.* London: Murray.

**2.** *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, &c. By the Rev. R. D. HAMPDEN, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.* London: Fellowes.

It would be impossible for us to bring our labours to a close for this quarter without some remarks on a subject which has attracted so much of the public attention, and which bears so immediately on the interests of the Church, as the proposed appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford. When that appointment was made known, we confess that we were little prepared for the results which have followed in its wake. We had anticipated some protest being made by a small number of persons—themselves, perhaps, looked on with some degree of jealousy by others in the Church. We had rather looked to demonstrations in *favour* of Dr. Hampden from a part of the Church. We must admit our apprehension that many good and earnest-minded men might have been led by circumstances to imagine a substantial identity in principle between themselves and Dr. Hampden, which in truth did not exist. Yet, no one could contemplate without feelings of bitter pain, the effects which such an appointment might have on the Church at large. We do not allude so much to any special influence which might have been exercised by the individual alluded to, in promoting the theories which have gained for him an unenviable notoriety; as to the highly injurious effects which the fact of such an appointment might have exercised on the minds of large numbers of persons within the Church, who might infer, that doctrines of the most dangerous character, obstinately maintained, were no obstacle to the attainment of the episcopate in the English Church. We could imagine that we saw the smile of triumphant derision, with which the Romanist would congratulate us on our “Anglican” orthodoxy. We could anticipate the stunning effects of arguments founded on that one simple fact, and plied continually against ardent and thoughtful minds. We could see in it a storehouse of something more than his usual sophistry for

the Jesuit ; an apparent justification of the conduct of the apostate from his Church. This, and more than this, we could see ; for we did not believe that the Church was at this moment so capable of manifesting her substantial union as she has proved herself to be. Convinced as we were that the differences which have arisen have concealed much unity of faith, we certainly imagined that the divisions and controversies of past years had created a mutual distrust, which would have paralyzed the Church's action, even on this important occasion.

But, what no human hand could have effected, has been accomplished by the direct interference of Divine Providence. We cannot but express our deep sense—our firm conviction—that the hand of God has brought to pass what we now behold. We look beyond the mere circumstance of Dr. Hampden's appointment, and the opposition to which it has given rise. We regard what we see as a mighty movement which is regenerating the Church ; teaching it to know its vitality and its power ; uniting its scattered energies ; and exorcising the demon of distrust and discord, which had, for years, impeded its progress, and which alone has prevented its removal of every evil which has gathered around it. The Church of England, which was, three months ago, apparently divided, broken, and dispirited, has, by the threatened appointment of an unsound divine to the episcopate, suddenly awakened with the strength, as it were, of a "giant refreshed with wine ;" and, with a unanimity and a cordial mingling together of all sections and parties, such as we have never witnessed, except in 1833 and 1836, has resisted the will of the "powers that be," in the cause of violated and endangered faith.

Who could have anticipated the results which have followed from the announcement of the Minister's intentions ? We can really only express our sense of thankfulness, in contemplating the immense amount of good which has sprung from evil. Nothing, we believe, less than such a blow as this, could have aroused the whole Church so suddenly to a perception of her state. She will not now easily become fearful and despondent again. Her divisions are so far ended, that she can *act* unitedly, powerfully, perseveringly, for the accomplishment of her great objects. Let not the opportunity pass away ; but let her press forward to gain ample security for her faith, liberty to act for the purification of all corruptions, and means to evangelize the heathen at home and abroad.

We are desirous, in our allusions to the painful circumstances of Dr. Hampden's case, to speak with the respect which is due at once to his personal character and his station ; nor are we about to weary the reader with any lengthy detail of opinions which

were by no means lucidly expressed, and which it is difficult to explain by mere citations. The great objection to Dr. Hampden's doctrine lay, in our opinion, not so much in his positive statements of doctrine, as in that undisguised latitudinarianism which placed the Socinian on a level with the orthodox believer, and thus in fact, and indeed *expressly*, led to the inference, that all doctrines whatever, *e. g.* those of our Creeds, were merely human opinions, and not articles of faith; that there was really no *necessity* for believing any fixed doctrine whatever. There were many expressions which went to subvert the authority of the Creeds and Articles, the respect due to the sacraments, and which were unsound in themselves: but the master evil of the system was, its latitudinarianism; which, of course, leads to infidelity. These sentiments were put forth from time to time, partly in the Bampton Lectures, published in 1833, but in a much more open form in a subsequent publication on the admission of dissenters to the universities. Amidst the storm of pamphlets which then made their appearance, and the general excitement of the controversy, little notice was taken of this production, dangerous as it was felt to be by many persons. But when, in a year or two afterwards, the author was suddenly promoted, to the general surprise of men, to the important station of leading Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, it was felt, that opinions so dangerous ought not to be promulgated to students of divinity without warning and remonstrance; and hence arose first an effort to prevent the appointment, and on the failure of this attempt, a censure was passed by the convocation of the university on Dr. Hampden, as a teacher in whom the university placed no trust. This sentence was confirmed a few years ago, when an attempt was made to reverse it in convocation; and in both cases the decision of the university was carried by overwhelming majorities.

The most painful feature in the whole matter to our mind was, the contumacious spirit manifested throughout by the writer who had given so much offence. At the earliest stage of the proceedings, on the matter of the censure, offers were made to withdraw any further steps, if some retractation were made; but this offer was positively refused; and from that moment the course uniformly taken, was to represent the whole proceedings as dictated by the most unworthy party motives, and to justify all that had been put forth. No admission of fault or error was ever made; nothing was ever done except with a view of showing that all objections arose from mistake or ill-will. The controversy after a time went to sleep, or was overborne by other matters of pressing moment; but the Church certainly did not anticipate the

elevation of a theologian thus under censure to the episcopal bench. It could scarcely have been imagined that in these days of weak governments, any minister could venture to run the risk of making such an appointment.

We are, we confess, rather concerned, for his own sake, that the present minister should have made so serious a mistake; because we cannot help feeling some gratitude to him for his offer of four bishoprics to the Church. We are convinced that the present step is one which will inflict some injury on the Whig ministry; and if it should lead to the return of Sir Robert Peel to power, we should certainly gain nothing by the change. From the party which adheres to *that* statesman, the Church has no good to anticipate: she is only indebted to them for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act in 1828; Emancipation in 1829; for the Endowment of Maynooth and the "Godless colleges" in 1845; for the admission of Jewish legislators in 1847. Amidst professions of regard for the Church, they have on every opportunity betrayed her to her enemies, and refused to promote her interest. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel opposed the preservation of the Welsh sees; they opposed the creation of additional bishoprics. On one pretence or another that ministry always put down those vital questions. When Mr. Frewen brought in his bill for erecting new sees, it was met by Sir Robert Peel with *ridicule*; and Sir James Graham, in reply to arguments for augmenting the number of sees, contended that bishoprics are mere *sinecures*.

We trust, however, that the Church has the power even of making such men aid her. She has power enough, we think, if it were properly applied, to convert *any ministry whatever* into her coadjutors. She can make it the *interest* of a minister to grant her supplications. So that, whoever may be minister, we would tell her to hold on her course in firm and assured hope. Nothing in this country will resist the most powerful body in it, when it seeks for its just rights with union, temperance, and perseverance.

Lord John Russell has taken a step which has involved him in great difficulties, and we are inclined to regret it for the sake of his ministry as we have said. We also regret the unfortunate recognition of the Romish hierarchy in Ireland as "Lord Bishops," and the erection of Romish sees in England; *and* the avowed wish for the renewal of diplomatic relations between England and Rome, on the part of the present ministry. These are very "awkward facts;" and we confess that in looking at them, we cannot say that the present Government deserves in any degree the support of Churchmen.

We do not suppose that Sir Robert Peel would have made Dr.

Hampden a bishop, because his political connexions were different. Otherwise we see no reason why the appointment might not as well have taken place under the one ministry as under the other.

But we must now recur to the facts of the case. Notwithstanding the twofold censure of the university on Dr. Hampden, Lord John Russell actually nominates him to the see of Hereford; and then at once arises a struggle between the Church and the Minister. The clergy meet in their rural deaneries and arch-deaconries, and send addresses to the Crown, the Archbishop, their own Bishops, the Dean and Chapter of Hereford—the laity join in the contest. Thirteen or fourteen bishops protest against this appointment, and several others are unfavourable to it. In all these movements hitherto the remarkable feature is the absence of violent or party feeling of any kind. All parties appear to be acting under the influence of a strongly conscientious feeling—a solemn responsibility to preserve the purity of the Christian faith, and to save the Church from giving her sanction to dangerous error. In almost all cases the petition has been for examination of the doctrinal fitness of the person proposed for the episcopate. There has been no positive condemnation or rejection of the individual generally, but a request that satisfaction may be afforded to the Church before his appointment takes place. Now all this is most entirely satisfactory; and we feel assured that it must in the end have most salutary effects.

Dr. Hampden, in his letter to Lord John Russell, just published, adopts precisely the course which has hitherto been pursued. The object of this publication is to impute the proceedings against him in 1836 to party feeling, and other motives of the most unworthy description. We very greatly lament the course which the opponents of the censure have invariably pursued in this respect, because it is equally unjust and uncharitable. That some individuals may have been under the influence of feelings more or less blamable in promoting that censure, we have no power of disproving; it is very possible that some individuals may have been actuated by prejudice or other faults: but then it is a very uncharitable, and, we must say, a very unreasonable view, which ascribes to the great body of those who engaged in that movement—men, who certainly were then, and always remained, wholly independent of the “Tractarian” movement, and were even *strongly opposed* to it in many cases, the imputation of mere “party-spirit” or personal hostility, in these movements. With reference to the imputation of “Romanizing,” attached to those who promoted that movement, we have only to refer to the signatures to the “Declaration of Resident Members of Convocation,” (March 10, 1836,) in opposition to Dr. Hampden’s system of



theology. Of the *eighty-two* persons who signed that declaration, three only have become Romanists ; while the great majority are men who have always kept aloof from the "Tractarian" theology, or even opposed it. In that list are to be found the names of some of its *most active and conspicuous* opponents—the names of those tutors who protested against Dr. Pusey's Sermon—the names of many who are connected with a system of theology the very reverse of "Tractarian."

We are not here entering into the controversy ; but merely doing what, we conceive, is a simple act of justice, in clearing the motives of those who took part in what Lord John Russell designates as an "unworthy proceeding," and which is stigmatized by Dr. Hampden as the result of mere party feeling. We think that such imputations on the motives and feelings of a very large body of clergy and laity, for expressing their sense of the unsoundness of Dr. Hampden's publications, little consistent with that spirit of charity and of Christian generosity, which does not *unnecessarily* impute wrong motives. It cannot, of course, be expected, that Dr. Hampden and his friends should approve the proceedings against him ; but the tone which has been adopted by them, is peculiarly inconsistent in those who declaim against the "party spirit" and "uncharitableness" of others ; and we certainly feel the deepest pain, in contemplating the exhibition of such feelings in any one who is looking to the most solemn Christian office of a *bishop*—an office for which humility, meekness, and a spirit of forgiveness and charity, are the most fitting and most indispensable qualifications. Looking at the subject in this point of view, we confess that the tone of Dr. Hampden's letter seems to be a matter for more regret, than even the errors into which he was formerly led.

We assert our calm and rooted conviction, that the measures adopted against Dr. Hampden, in 1836, arose from a deeply-conscientious feeling in large numbers of persons who were entirely free from party-connexions. Such persons may, undoubtedly, have been deceived in the view which they took of Dr. Hampden's views ; they may have been mistaken in their own opinions ; as on the other hand, Dr. Hampden may have been unsound in his doctrines, and rash in his statements ; but we do not see, that Dr. Hampden, or any one else, has a right to impute "dishonesty" or "party-spirit" to his opponents. We trust that intemperate and uncharitable expressions of this kind, will not induce any churchman to injure the cause of truth by imitating or retorting them.

Having made these few observations on the general spirit and temper of Dr. Hampden's Letter, we must cite a few passages

from that production. We are unwilling to speak discourteously in any way; but when we find Dr. Hampden now not only asserting the orthodoxy of his belief, but maintaining that such a belief is *necessary to salvation*—when we find him asserting, that the articles of our faith are *not* mere human theories; and that Socinians and dissenters are *not* as sound Christians as those who adhere to the Catholic faith and the apostolic discipline, we are, of course, gratified at such explicit statements: but we must take the liberty to say, that the works on which the censure of 1836 was founded, convey a totally different system. It is not merely in isolated expressions, but in the whole tone and tendency of those writings, that a system of Latitudinarianism on the most vital points may be traced. We do not wish to hold Dr. Hampden to that system; we are bound to believe him sincere in the exposition which he now makes of his faith. We do not expect to hear from him again such expressions of Latitudinarianism as those which shocked and pained all true churchmen. But, at the same time, we must express our firm and unhesitating conviction, that the doctrines advocated by Dr. Hampden, previous to 1836, were the very reverse of what he has now stated. His present statement of views, like that in his Inaugural Lecture, amounts, in one sense, to a retraction of his previous theories. It is a direct denial of those theories; a denial too, that he ever held them. We select a few passages illustrative of his present opinions:—

“ I do not, and never did . . . hold or maintain any other doctrine respecting our Lord's most holy Person and his blessed work of Redemption, than that which is plainly set forth in Scripture, in the Articles, and Formularies of our Church. I hold too, and have ever held most firmly, the full doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as stated on the same authority in the same documents of the Church. . . . My conviction has been that no sermon, no exposition of religious doctrine, or exhortation to religious conduct, could have any unction of spiritual instruction, any living power to teach or to persuade, which did not derive its strength from those holy and lovely truths, which describe to us God the Father giving his only-begotten Son, his co-equal in majesty and power, ‘ to the end that all that believe in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life ’—God the Son giving Himself in love, taking on Him our nature, and born into the world, living and dying for us men, and for our salvation,—God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, the third person in the Blessed Trinity, sent down with holy comfort from the Saviour, to instruct and guide the Church through all ages.”

“ These great revealed verities as not mere opinions collected by speculative reasoning, but the manifest indisputable teaching of Scripture, without which Scripture would not be what it is—I have then ever

taught and enforced both as most certain and as most necessary to be believed."

"It is not my teaching, whatever may have been attempted to be shown by prejudiced adversaries, that the doctrines of Scripture, or any other of its great fundamental truths, such as Original Sin, Justification by Faith, preventing and assisting Grace, the efficacy of the two Sacraments instituted by our Lord, are nothing more than theories formed by the human mind on the text of Scripture." . . . "Most sincerely, then, and most firmly do I believe that there is but one Catholic faith—one invariable standard of orthodox truth; and that all departures from this, consequently, are errors of doctrine, and corruptions of the faith, and not that 'form of sound words' which God has set forth to us in his Revelations." . . . "I would do nothing to encourage dissent from the Church. It grieves me whenever I see it. But at the same time I am for full toleration, if dissent be only open and avowed; a toleration, that is, extending not only to the grant of civil privileges to dissenters, but to the equitable and kind consideration of their statements and arguments, as well as of their feelings. I would try to win them over—I would not exasperate them. I would not presume to surrender God's truth, which is not mine to give away, or to call error and falsehood by the sacred name of Truth. . . . If accordingly, on any occasion I have ever ventured to call Unitarians Christians, surely this must be understood in the wide charitable sense of the term—not in that strict sense in which it belongs to a believer in the divinity and the blessed atonement of our Lord."

"I repeat, I not only regard the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord, and the salvation of man through faith only in Him, with the truths arising out of, and closely connected with these great doctrines, as most certain, but further as vitally important to be believed, in order to a saving faith, and a right practical religion."

Now, all this is, as a mere statement of Dr. Hampden's present belief, very satisfactory. We are bound to believe him sincere in these statements, and we are not disposed to cavil at particular expressions. We think the statements are sufficient in themselves; and we are bound to believe, that Dr. Hampden has persuaded himself that his earlier writings, on which the censure was founded, inculcated the same principles: but we think, that there are *very few persons indeed*, who, on perusing these writings, and more especially his "Observations on Religious Dissent," would not arrive at a contrary conclusion.

We now select a few specimens of Dr. Hampden's former teaching:—

"Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself, there are *no doctrines*. What we read there is matter of fact: either fact nakedly set forth, as

it occurred ; or fact explained and elucidated by the light of inspiration cast upon it."—Bampton Lect. p. 374.

"A fundamental characteristic of the Christian Scriptures, which totally precludes all deduction of speculative conclusions concerning religious truths . . . that the whole revelation contained in them, so far as it is revelation, consists of *matter of fact*."—*Observations on Dissent*, pp. 13, 14.

"No speculative deductions from the language of Scripture carry with them the force of Divine truth. Pious opinions indeed we may form. . . . Such, indeed, are the doctrinal statements of our Articles. I may wish there were less of dogmatism in them. Still I cannot but approve them for the piety which pervades them ; but pious opinions, it must be observed, are not parts of revelation."—*Obs.* p. 14.

"If all opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature—it is only a fallacy to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant."—*Obs.* p. 5.

"Putting him [the Unitarian], however, on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, in which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh within himself, whether it is not theological dogmatism, and not religious belief, properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent."—*Obs.* pp. 20, 21.

"The general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence (viz. the theory of inward grace working by outward signs.)"—*Bamp. Lect.* p. 315.

We will not weary the reader by further quotations on a matter which is probably familiar to him ; but merely remark, that it seems quite impossible to reconcile Dr. Hampden's present doctrines with such passages as we have quoted, and which are a very imperfect, though a fair specimen, as far as it goes, of the general spirit of his writings.

What may be the issue of the matter yet remains to be seen. We are content to leave the matter to the wise discretion of the heads of the Church, in full confidence that such steps will be taken for examining the doctrine of the proposed candidate for the episcopal office, as the gravity and importance of the case demands. Whatever may be the issue, we argue nothing but good from the manifestation which has been made of the fidelity of the Church to the cause of Christian truth,—a manifestation which will have consequences extending beyond any mere opposition to an individual accused of unsound doctrine.

There is, however, one further comment which we feel called upon to make on Dr. Hampden's Letter. That divine has now expressed sentiments which are, as far as they go, orthodox : but

he accompanies this expression by an assertion, that he has *always* taught and inculcated the very same doctrines. He therefore justifies and adheres to all his former publications, and the sentiments contained in them.

Here, then, the question arises, is Dr. Hampden *alone* to pronounce judgment on the views and character of his former publications? Or are not others equally competent with himself to exercise their judgment on those productions? We have, then, on one side, merely the assertion of Dr. Hampden that his works inculcate the principles which he now professes; on the other, we have the declaration of the University of Oxford, that they *do not*. Those works were published; and, as in the cases of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Ward, others were competent to judge of the meaning and effect of those publications as well, or better, perhaps, than the author himself could do. Therefore, as far as regards the publications referred to, we think that Dr. Hampden's Letter leaves the matter exactly as it found it. He is, notwithstanding his statements of orthodox opinions, still at liberty to recommend publications, which, in the view of the University of Oxford, inculcate doctrines subversive of those which he has now stated; for no one can believe for a moment, that if *such* had been his teaching before 1836 as it is in 1842, any censure would have been carried, or even dreamt of.

We submit these considerations to those persons who are competent to decide on the important question, whether Dr. Hampden's present statements are sufficient to cover any alleged defects in his former teaching, when that teaching is maintained by himself to have been, throughout, orthodox and sound. *This* seems to us, we confess, to complicate the question very much. Had Dr. Hampden simply stated his present belief, without identifying himself with all he has ever written, there could not, we think, have been any further ground for objection.

We hail, with the strongest feelings of gratitude and respect, the appearance of the following protest, addressed to the Prime Minister:—

“ PROTEST OF THE BISHOPS.

“ My Lord,—We, the undersigned Bishops of the Church of England, feel it our duty to represent to your Lordship, as head of Her Majesty's Government, the apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the clergy by the rumoured nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden; in the soundness of whose doctrine the University of Oxford has affirmed, by a solemn decree, its want of confidence.

“ We are persuaded that your Lordship does not know how deep and general a feeling prevails on this subject; and we consider our—

selves to be acting only in the discharge of our bounden duty, both to the Crown and to the Church, when we respectfully, but earnestly express to your Lordship our conviction, that if this appointment be completed, there is the greatest danger, both of the interruption of the peace of the Church, and of the disturbance of the confidence which it is most desirable that the clergy and laity of the Church should feel in every exercise of the Royal Supremacy, especially as regards that very delicate and important particular, the nomination to vacant sees.

"We have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's obedient faithful servants,

"C. J. LONDON.

C. WINTON.

J. LINCOLN.

CHR. BANGOR.

HUGH CARLISLE.

G. ROCHESTER.

RICH. BATH AND WELLS.

J. H. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

H. EXETER.

E. SARUM.

A. T. CHICHESTER.

T. ELY.

SAML. OXON.

"To the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, &c."

In addition to this, the primate is understood to have remonstrated against the appointment; three other bishops have expressed themselves unfavourable to it; and the Bishop of Ripon has sent in a separate protest. So that eighteen prelates, a large majority of the episcopal body in England and Wales, have protested in some way against the measure. Such a fact as this is most honourable to the English episcopate; it evinces a conscientious anxiety for the welfare of religion, and the unity of the Church, which must, we think, secure for those prelates the respect and admiration of all conscientious men. Aware as we are of the influence which the minister of the day always exercises over various members of the hierarchy, and also making allowance for the spirit of caution and timidity which naturally holds back men in high stations from taking any steps calculated to excite comment, we offer no remarks on that portion of the hierarchy who have abstained from taking any part in the present matter. We feel assured that we should be guilty of a very great injustice in supposing that any one of those prelates concurs in the Latitudinarianism which elicited the condemnation of the University of Oxford.

The reply of Lord John Russell to this communication<sup>1</sup> con-

<sup>1</sup> The reply is as follows :—

"My Lords,—I have had the honour to receive a representation signed by your Lordships, on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford.

"I observe that your Lordships do not state any want of confidence on your part in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine. Your Lordships refer me to a decree of the University of Oxford, passed eleven years ago, and founded upon lectures delivered fifteen years ago.

"Since the date of that decree Dr. Hampden has acted as Regius Professor of Divinity. The University of Oxford, and many bishops, as I am told, have required



tains one or two passages which deserve some comment. His Lordship avails himself dexterously of the mere wording of the episcopal remonstrance, to say, "Your Lordships do not state any want of confidence, on *your* part, in the soundness of Dr. Hampden's doctrine;" as if the mere fact of their reference to the censure of the university did not imply an opinion that such censure was not unjust. His Lordship also states, that some months before he named Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford, "he signified his intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement." We must here refer to the Bishop of Exeter's reply to this observation:—

"My Lord, your Lordship will, I am confident, pardon my inquiry (for the question is manifestly most important to the fair understanding of the merits of the case,) did you ask his Grace whether he thought Dr. Hampden a fit person to be recommended to a bishopric? If you did not *ask* his opinion, few persons will be at all surprised that he abstained from giving it. Your Lordship better knows than I can presume to guess, what are the relations between his Grace and yourself; what your habits of consultation with him on this and kindred questions: but thus much I must say, that unless these relations be most intimate, these habits most unreserved, it would seem to be almost a matter of course that our aged primate, one always distinguished by his delicacy and reluctance to obtrude, without absolute necessity, the expression of any opinion adverse to the interests of another.—It would seem to me, I repeat, a matter of course that his Grace should forbear to tell your Lordship, that your intention of recommending Dr. Hampden at some period, which might never come during the continuance of

certificates of attendance on his lectures before they proceeded to ordain candidates who had received their education at Oxford. He has likewise preached sermons, for which he has been honoured with the approbation of several prelates of our Church.

"Several months before I named Dr. Hampden to the Queen for the See of Hereford, I signified my intention to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and did not receive from him any discouragement.

"In these circumstances it appears to me, that should I withdraw my recommendation of Dr. Hampden, which has been sanctioned by the Queen, I should virtually assent to the doctrine that a decree of the University of Oxford is a perpetual ban of exclusion against a clergyman of eminent learning and irreproachable life, and that in fact, the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown, is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of the Universities.

"Nor should it be forgotten that many of the most prominent among that majority have since joined the communion of the Church of Rome.

"I deeply regret the feeling that is said to be common among the clergy on this subject. But I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.

"At the same time I thank your Lordships for an interposition which I believe to be intended for the public benefit.

"I am, &c.

"J. RUSSELL."

442 *Appointments to Bishoprics.—Dr. Hampden's Case.*

your Lordship's power of recommending, or during his own valuable life, would involve you in the difficulty of having named a person, whose appointment would be regarded by the Church at large as an act either of wanton insult, or of official recklessness, beyond all precedent."

But the most serious part of this question still remains. The minister is of opinion, that were he to withdraw his recommendation of Dr. Hampden, he would assent to the doctrine that "*the supremacy which is now by law vested in the Crown, is to be transferred to a majority of the members of one of our universities;*" and that "he cannot sacrifice . . . *the rights of the Crown . . . to a feeling which he believes to be founded on misapprehension, and fomented by prejudice.*" And, in accordance with this view of the case, a member starts up in the House of Commons, and inquires "if a letter put forth as signed by certain prelates, and appearing to attempt *an interference with the just prerogatives of the Crown, as the supreme head of the Established Church,* and the reply to this remonstrance, were authentic?"

The Bishop of Exeter, in his letter to Lord John Russell, takes notice of objections of this kind in the following terms:—

"My Lord, if instead of a decree having been passed against Dr. Hampden, for unsound teaching, by the University of Oxford, a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench had been pronounced against him for some flagitious crime; and if this judgment were urged as a reason why he should not be promoted to a bishopric; would this be to transfer the royal supremacy from the Crown to Lord Denman? If it would not, why should it be said to follow from Dr. Hampden's being disqualified for a bishopric, so long as he is under the censure of the Oxford decree, that this is to transfer the supremacy of the Crown to the Convocation of Oxford?"

This is an excellent and complete answer. But we do not suppose that it will have much weight with the Minister to whom it is addressed, or with any one who is, or hopes to be a minister. It is particularly inconvenient to ministers to have their patronage interfered with. It is what they do not mean to tolerate, if they can help themselves. Ministers of state do not trouble themselves much about questions of orthodoxy or heterodoxy in making their appointments. They look to quite different considerations. They are merely anxious to provide comfortably for this or that friend or favourite; and why any one should interfere with the power which they have, of "giving away" certain places worth 5000*l.* or 6000*l.* a year, they cannot conceive. The Crown (*i. e.* the Minister) is in their opinion "omnipotent" in such matters. This is the "orthodox" creed, according to the ministerial version. The Minister deems himself absolute in all such matters.

The Church has no right to object to nominations. It is an interference with "the supremacy of the Crown."

We much fear, that notwithstanding this lofty doctrine, the Church will be found on various occasions acting on the contrary principle. The ultramontanism of the Minister will be met by the Gallicanism of the Church. We apprehend that such notions of absolute power, however well they might sound in the times of Henry VIII., will not pass current in the days of Victoria. Unless we are greatly deceived, the Church will have to sustain, from Infidels, Whigs, Radicals, and Conservatives, sundry hard names, insults, and reproaches for her alleged interference with the royal prerogative, until it becomes the interest of politicians to take her part, and to find out that she is eminently loyal to the Crown, and faithful to her principles. We trust that all such imputations as we speak of, will be received with perfect good humour and patience; and that they will only serve to encourage the Church in seeking for those great objects which have long been before her, and which she has now been roused by Divine Providence to contemplate with increased attention, and to pursue with more united and harmonious zeal.

We cannot but look on the whole circumstance of this controversy, in connexion with the present position and the prospects of the Church, as opening out to improvements which we should scarcely have ventured a few months since to contemplate as possible for many years to come. More especially does the present aspect of affairs bring before the Church some very serious considerations in her present position in reference to the appointment of bishops.

The constitution invests the Crown with the patronage of all bishoprics; that is to say, the Crown now possesses the rights which were originally vested in the *people*. Originally the bishops of the Church were elected by the clergy and people, and confirmed by the comprovincial bishops. Now the Crown only appoints, though the chapter nominally elects. This power of the Crown has devolved wholly on the Minister of the day. He disposes of bishoprics at pleasure. He is not bound to consult the heads of the Church before doing so. He can compel a chapter under penalty of *præmunire* to elect. Now then comes the question, "Is this a state of things which affords sufficient *security* to the Church for the appointment of bishops who are really qualified for this office?" We do not say that good appointments have not been sometimes made; on that point we have nothing to say. We are only speaking of the theory; and we do say that the present state of the law is unsatisfactory on this matter, and that it needs to be amended. To talk in these days of preserving immu-

#### 444 *Appointments to Bishoprics.—Dr. Hampden's Case.*

tably arrangements made in the reign of Henry VIII., as if circumstances might not have changed in the course of three centuries, would be absurd. There can be no more reason why the act of Henry regulating the appointment of bishops should not be altered, than there was against abolishing the securities which were made in subsequent reigns against the encroachments of Romanism. We submit that there is, and long has been a general opinion, that the present provisions with regard to bishoprics are not adapted to the present age. They relate to a different order of things, when the Sovereign himself appointed to bishoprics, and when the power of the Sovereign was arbitrary and tyrannical. They are relics of Tudor legislation, conceived in the tone of absolutism prevalent in that age; and altogether unsuited to the "liberality" of modern ideas.

But, however this may be, one thing is certain, that when this law was enacted, the sovereign in whom the appointment was vested, was strictly of the same faith as the Church; but now, when the appointments have fallen to the share of the ministry of the day, and bishoprics have become "perquisites of office," and means of gratifying high families, the case is wholly changed. Bishoprics are now granted by ministers in the way which they deem most conducive to their own interests. Sometimes unexceptionable appointments are made; sometimes exceptionable appointments are made. We have an instance before us; we should have had another if Dr. Arnold had lived. Bad appointments have been made before now; and whatever be the practical result, the minister has, by law, an *arbitrary* power of appointing bishops. There is nothing whatever to prevent him from appointing indolent, worldly, proud, money-loving men. He may people the Church with bishops and clergy of this description; and thus ruin it as effectually, if not more so, than if he appointed men of unsound doctrine.

Now, we assert as a positive matter of history, that the Crown itself never possessed this power of *absolute* appointment to bishoprics until the enactment of the law in the reign of Henry VIII. It is a mere legal fiction to assert that they possessed it previously. They did not hold any such absolute power in Anglo-Saxon times: they did not do so in Norman times. The chapters and bishops took part in the appointments; and then the popes took them exclusively. Then the kings and the popes concurred in the appointment. There was always some real check somewhere in the Church over appointments till the time of Henry VIII. Now, the minister exercises the regal powers, and he is influenced by a Parliament comprising (in consequence of recent enactments) Romanists, and Dissenters of all kinds. Then we say, that all

is affords *prima facie* grounds for *examining* the present state of the law in regard to appointments to bishoprics.

The law,—and *the law only*,—gives to the Crown the sole power it now possesses of appointing to episcopal sees. The Parliament can alter, or amend, or repeal that law. The object of investing the Crown with power to nominate bishops is public utility. It is also held most fitting,—and the reason of the thing is evident,—that bishops, who are lords of Parliament, should be created by the Crown, which is the source of temporal dignity. To all this no objection can be offered; but the question still remains whether it is fitting, considering all circumstances, that the minister should possess an *arbitrary and despotic* power of appointing to bishoprics.

The appointment to bishoprics is, as any one must admit, a solemn *trust* reposed in the Crown by the Church and the nation. It is not of the nature of other patronage: it has peculiar responsibilities attached. Is there now *any security*, that this trust will be properly discharged? The Crown, we know, has *practically* lost, for a long time, the appointment to bishoprics; it is not able to discharge its trust. The theory of the constitution, in this respect, is all that remains.

If this be so, as is notoriously the case, there can be nothing unconstitutional in attempting to alter and amend the present practice, provided the theoretical power of the Crown be not affected. There can be nothing unconstitutional in attempting to limit the power of the *ministers* of the Crown, or to take from them certain powers, provided the rights of the Crown be not affected; and this we think may be done in the case under consideration. There is no sort of impossibility in obtaining legal securities for proper appointment to bishoprics, if the proper amount of power be brought to bear on the question. There may be difficulties in the way we admit; but no measure of reform is now beyond the reach of perseverance and unanimity. The Church can, if she will, recover the appointment of her bishops from the ministers of the day, or, at least, gain ample securities for the very best appointments.

There is only one mode of gaining this end. Petition Parliament steadily; and push forward a legislative measure on the subject. Never mind *threats* or defeat in one or two sessions. Bring it in year after year; and it must, in the end, succeed, if it be sufficiently supported by the Church.

The appointment of Dr. Hampden is bringing this question to an issue. We have had an example of what is *possible*, under the present system. The Church is put in the painful position of opposing her Majesty's government. This, surely, ought not to

be. The possibility of such collisions should be prevented by an alteration in the law. It has been said, that the appointment of Dr. Hampden is only the first of a *series* of appointments of men of similar principles. At all events, there is no security against the appointment of secular and unworthy bishops. The Church cannot now shut her eyes any longer to the danger in which she is placed by the present state of the law. Is she content, we ask, to have such appointments repeated? Is she content to sit still, and to see men made bishops *merely* because they have been private tutors in one great family, schoolmasters to another, college-tutors to a third, or cousins to a fourth? Can the Church,—can religion prosper,—while such a system of appointments is tolerated? Why should not the Church have the very best and most highly qualified men as bishops? Why should she be obliged to be satisfied with any one who may be appointed bishop, provided he is free from *positive objections*? Why should she look, at most, for merely negative qualifications in bishops, and be *thankful* if a man is not actually an Arian, a Socinian, or a drunkard? Is this the whole of what the Church may fairly lay claim to? Has she not a right,—an indefeasible right, to look for the most eminent qualifications—for zeal, *holiness*, learning, judgment, acquaintance with professional duties, popularity, ability, power in preaching? Has she not a claim founded in justice and in religion, to some real and effectual provision for the appointment of such bishops? And has she, in the present state of the law, any provision of the kind?

We would take the recommendation of persons to episcopal sees entirely out of the hands of ministers, and put it in the hands of commissioners appointed by the Crown, but satisfactory to the Church. Then let the Crown retain its power of issuing *conges d'élire*. Let these commissioners become the Queen's ministers for disposing of ecclesiastical preferment. This would meet at once the theory of the constitution, and the wants of the Church. In any plan for erecting new sees we trust that some such provision will be made; for we feel satisfied, that the Church will require some security that her episcopal offices shall not be degraded into means of carrying on the government of the State. In the case of sees which have no parliamentary seat, there could not be a shadow of a pretence for giving to the minister of the day the sole nomination. There could be no reason, even, why the Crown must necessarily be brought in at all in such a case. Where there is no *peerage* conferred, there seems no principle on which the right of the Crown could be put forward. It seems desirable, however, to adhere, as far as possible, to the forms of the constitution, and therefore we should rather



think it advisable to leave the Crown the power which it now possesses, but to take its exercise out of the hands of the temporal ministry, who are, we maintain, eminently unfitted for such a trust.

The government in other countries can be carried on without giving to the ministry of the day the sole power of appointing bishops. In every Romish country the government names to episcopal sees, but the pope has the absolute power of rejecting candidates. In the United States the government has nothing to do with appointments to episcopal sees; and yet it is carried on. True, America is a democracy, and its government is weak. But is not England also governed by a democracy? Is it not in fact a republic, with monarchical institutions? To imagine that government could not be conducted as well as it is in England, without the aid of episcopal patronage, would be most mistaken. If patronage be necessary to a government, it will always find means of creating it. If great families or political interests require incomes, or places for their relations or friends, they will be found. In this day of new places, and new commissionerships, there can be surely no imperative necessity to throw the bishoprics into the sweepings of ministerial patronage. Bishoprics *need* not be disposed of precisely on the same principles as commissionerships of sewers or of hackney coaches. The machine of the State would not actually come to a dead lock, if the *ministerial* patronage of bishoprics were interfered with. We suppose that the temporal power is not so wholly dependent on the Church for existence, that it might not continue to exist even if there were no Church at all. What would the State do, if there were *no Bishoprics* to present to? We have no doubt, that there are politicians, and perhaps some who have been, and who expect to be, ministers, who would look on such a case as by no means inconceivable; and who would be fully prepared to undertake the government in such circumstances. We are aware that such men look on the episcopate as a sinecure; and with their views, we cannot see why they should not, one of these days, abolish it—IF THEY COULD.

The truth is, we believe, that the power of disposing absolutely of bishoprics does not tend to strengthen any ministry in the present day. It is a patronage which does them quite as much harm as good. The government of the country depends almost wholly on public opinion; and there is nothing which is calculated to bring more discredit on a ministry than any great mistake in the exercise of episcopal patronage. Thus a minister, if he has a particle of discretion, is compelled to seek the advice of others in distributing his patronage. There must be *some* caution and

management in his proceedings. If he makes such a mistake as Lord John Russell has now made, the country is up in arms against him, and his ministry is endangered. The political parties who may be anxious to dispossess him of office, secretly foment the disturbance. Even if appointments are not such as to create open opposition, still if they are otherwise bad, they create strong and general dissatisfaction. They are an element of opposition to the ministry. We hold that the conduct of ministers who might be more apprehensive of open scandal in such appointments than Lord John Russell is, might just as effectually injure their own influence by a different mode of proceedings. If the Church should see men promoted who were merely remarkable for skill in mechanics, or in some branch of philosophy—men unpractised in the duties of the ministry—men who had paid no attention to theology, to the cure of souls, to preaching—men of worldly, money-loving characters—or men of mere high connexions and rank—then we do say that such appointments would add nothing to the strength of any ministry; they would be deeply and universally blamed.

The Church cannot but feel the vital importance of possessing bishops who are really adequate to their work, and fitted for it. The Church feels, that the bishop ought to be the mainspring of his diocese—not merely the weight which is to prevent its machinery from going too fast. He is not merely to sit on his tribunal and to determine all causes which may be laid before him; but to communicate an impulse to Christian zeal, and to set an example of pastoral vigilance and apostolical fervour to the whole body of clergy, whose leader he is. He is to be the pastor of his diocese; warning, exhorting, constraining them by love and by Christian reproofs, to advance in the path of salvation. Such is the nature of the episcopal office: it is really and truly the office of an apostle; and it demands an apostolical character. When men of any inferior character are appointed, a deep injury is done to the office and the Church. It is the duty of those who possess the power of electing to the episcopal office, to *search* for such men. They ought to go to the humblest curacy in the land, if there could be found the man who had shown by his conduct the possession of peculiar qualifications for the apostolical office. We must speak our mind with freedom when the most vital interests of religion are concerned; and we trust that the cause in which we plead will excuse the openness of our statements. It seems to us, then, that persons who have spent their lives in the management of public schools, or of colleges, or as professors in the universities—persons who have not been conversant with the wants, the feelings, and the duties of the

parochial clergy, are, as a general rule, not the class from whom bishops ought to be selected. The episcopal office, is in itself a development of the office of the parochial clergyman on a large scale; as the parochial office is a derivative and compendium of the episcopal office. To the parochial clergy, we think, or to those who have actually been diligently engaged in the cure of souls—should the Church look for her bishops. It is this class which has produced the holy and self-denying men who now labour as bishops in the colonies. A professor may be learned and brilliant—a head of a house, or a schoolmaster, may be accustomed to the government of youth—but does it follow that they will possess the apostolical spirit, the humility, the fervour, the moral power, which ought to reside in a bishop? We should be glad to see bishoprics offered to men, whose conscientiousness would induce them to shrink from the solemn responsibility, and who could be with difficulty brought to accept it.

We are aware that such views may, by many persons, be regarded as Utopian; they have become so accustomed to a different order of things, that they cannot conceive the possibility of realizing in any degree the highest notions of the episcopal character; they are impressed with a feeling, that the best days of the Church are gone, and that we can only look for increasing evils. They content themselves with remaining in passive despondency; they cannot nerve their hearts to make aggressions on the spirit of the world. They imagine that the theory or the practice of the Church in the past days of the Hanoverian dynasty was faultless and perfect. They can only conceive the power of evil growing and increasing in these latter times. Looking on the vain struggles of thirty years to prevent the political aggrandizement of popery, and of liberalism, they deem the Church powerless to do more than check the downward progress of things, and preserve some relics of her own constitution and character.

And there are others whom we honour and love. They are men who have toiled for the Church in single-minded devotion, without hope of reward except in witnessing the extension of her principles, and the overthrow of her enemies. They are men who have been always on the losing side, saddened and disappointed at times, but ever arising in fresh and salient energy to meet the foes of their faith. It is this race of determined and resolute men who have been the strength of the Church. Scattered, disorganized, without leaders, they have fought the good fight, and one by one have upheld the great principles which they had vowed to defend. Even these men cannot bring themselves to imagine that there is a power within the Church which is

capable of working her regeneration. They have witnessed the destruction of the *political* principles which they have from their childhood identified with the preservation of the Church; and they can only conceive the Church to hold her ground, if some political party is recalled to life.

There is, then, according to these views, no real hope for the Church. Who can reanimate the deadness of political principle? Who can hope to see honest and high-principled statesmen? The race is extinct. Interest and temporary expediency have for twenty years ruled the English councils; even honest and consistent party is at an end. Lord George Bentinck is as strong a liberal, on all essential points, as Sir Robert Peel. The Church has no party to look to, either at present or in prospect, as a party on which she can depend. As it is, *all parties*, we do not hesitate to say, are incapable of being trusted by the Church. Is there, then, any hope? We believe that numbers of good men are prepared to answer in the negative; they have made up their minds that nothing human will avail—that resignation to God's will is the only remedy.

Such a view is, we conceive, most mistaken. We admit its plausibility; we do not, in the slightest degree, wonder at its existence; but we are satisfied that it is not well-founded. The Church of England is, we believe and admit, incapable of opposing any effectual resistance at present to measures for the aggrandisement of popery. Much evil, in various forms, is before us. The "liberal" notions of the present age, will infallibly hurry on statesmen to concessions of all kinds to false religions, which ought never to have been made. As a *restrictive* power, we hold that the Church is, to a great degree, powerless. She can and will enter her *protest* against such violations of principle, and the time may come when she will have power, if she wishes, to reverse them; but she cannot now prevent such steps being taken. The case, however, is wholly different, when she herself comes forward with claims *for relief from grievances, or for reform of abuses*. *There* she acts with the spirit of the times, not against it; and *there* she will *gain* all she asks for, if she employs ordinary care and diligence. We are anxious to see a steady and consistent course of resistance to all such unprincipled and irreligious policy as led or may lead to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, to emancipation, to the endowment of Maynooth and the godless colleges—to the recognition of the Romish hierarchy, the admission of Jews into parliament, the institution of political relations between the papacy and England, and such other acts. But, we are far more anxious to see the Church arising in power, and in unanimity, to demand the possession of full powers to

legislate for her own members in spiritual matters ; to seek for a sufficient augmentation of the Episcopate, and ample legal securities for *good appointments* ; and for the means of sending her priests and deacons amongst the destitute masses of our population confided to her care. These are points, which, if they are sufficiently pressed by the Church, no party, or combination of parties, can possibly refuse to grant her. In *all* political parties she will find some persons who will plead her cause from principle. In all she will find persons who will do so from interest. She cannot long be resisted, if she is only united and active. The Church of England is more powerful, numerically, than Romanism, or any other body. She does not gain her objects, simply because she does not *seek* them. This must be so no more. Unless we are prepared to stand by and *permit* the Church to fall a prey to internal division, to want of discipline, to the obtrusion of false bishops on her episcopal thrones, to the venal and worldly policy of unprincipled statesmen and politicians, to the unceasing aggressions of Romanism, dissent, and infidelity ; unless we are prepared to witness such a process of gradual exhaustion of the life-blood of that sacred and cherished Mother of our faith, in whom the deepest affections, and the highest aspirations of churchmen are gathered together—we must not remain passive any longer, but lay hold, each man on his brother's hand, and join ourselves together, fearless of what the world may say, regardless of its taunts and its cold dissuasives ; and stand forth, in the face of man, to claim the Christian rights of our Church, and to pledge ourselves never to relinquish that cause. Away, we say, with parties, and party feelings, and all their littlenesses. Let those ill-omened names of “ High Church,” and “ Low Church,” and “ Evangelical,” be heard no more ; let us only be “ churchmen ;” let all our enmities cease ; and let us co-operate, heart with heart, and hand with hand, in the great cause which we have in common. In these times we trust, that men will not hold back from uniting in the Church's cause from mere *etiquette* ; or that they will await the sanction of higher powers (which will not be given) before they do what is in itself right and unquestionable.

If Rome is to raise a hierarchy amongst us, with the sanction of Government ; and if the wishes of the Church of England for an increase of her hierarchy are to be thwarted ; and if unsound appointments are to be made to our bishoprics ; it is high time for the Church to act for herself, and to plead her cause in a tone of earnestness which cannot be long resisted.

We are aware of the inconveniences which might result from the combination of persons of any peculiar cast of views for the promotion of vague and indefinite objects ; no combination of this

kind is wanted, and nothing of the kind would be useful in the present state of the Church. Any such combination would tend rather to divide the Church, and to expend on objects of, perhaps, minor importance, at least of inferior practical value, those energies which ought to be concentrated on a few great definite points. We do not want to see the movement of any particular party in the Church; no set of men are able of themselves to advance Church objects. The object to be aimed at, is to adopt such measures universally as shall make the Church, including all parties, work for certain points. We refer to the movement which has been made in Dr. Hampden's case as an illustration of our meaning. If we could see *every year* a similar movement made in favour of such great Church objects as we have in common, there would be every prospect of success. Suppose that every year, ten, fifteen, or twenty archdeaconries were set in motion, meetings of the clergy held, speeches made, resolutions and petitions to both Houses adopted, calling for a large increase in the number of bishops and clergy, securities for the appointment of good and efficient bishops, and the revival of some kind of Church legislature. Suppose, again, large numbers of petitions from the laity, or the clergy and laity united in their respective parishes. Suppose these petitions openly supported by many bishops in the House of Lords, and by several of the other peers. Suppose applications made to all the members of the House of Commons by respectable bodies of their *constituents* to support such petitions and measures founded on them. And again, suppose some bill embodying those wishes of the Church brought in by some independent member, approved generally by the Church, and pushed forward *steadily* year after year, in the same way in which Lord Powis managed the cause of the Welsh Church. Such is the mode of operations which we should be glad to see adopted. It has been found successful when adopted on a very limited scale in the case of the Bangor and St. Asaph sees. There is nothing in it which seems dangerous to the Church. There is no kind of impossibility in it. All that is required is, that the friends of the Church in all parts of the country should adopt some plan of agreement by which, as far as possible, the whole strength of the Church shall be brought out in furtherance of her great objects. We should think that in every deanery some kind of combination or association might be formed, either by a few individuals, or through clerical societies, for the purpose of moving that deanery, and also the whole archdeaconry, to petition every year in favour of Church objects, and to endeavour to influence the local parliamentary representatives.

We have found in the case of the Maynooth Bill, Romish



Emancipation, and many similar measures of a bad description, that petitions have not been attended to—that they have not sufficed to stop the passing of those dangerous measures. And this has disgusted many persons, and led them to think that there is no use in petitioning,—that petitions will always be rejected. This is not the case. Petitions are of no avail generally in *preventing* Parliament from doing a certain thing, when it has made up its mind to do it. If political parties are determined, “for certain reasons them moving,” to make this or that concession, or grant this or that favour, they will not be stopped by any number of petitions. But when they have no such determination,—when there is no specific measure before them to carry,—when they, in fact, are not aggressive, but merely defensive, passive, or indifferent (which is the case in all the great practical Church measures we have referred to), *then* Parliament will be found entirely open to petitions.

It may take some time, and a strong momentum, to induce Parliament to look Church questions in the face, with a resolution to promote them. There may be hostility on the part of Romish and dissenting members, indifference elsewhere; and unwillingness on the part of ministries to make alterations in a system which gives them patronage and influence: but all this will give way,—this passive resistance will not be able to stand long against a vigorous and combined movement on the part of the Church. Should this take place, it would become the interest, either of the minister of the day, or of some minister on entering office, to grant a part or the whole of the Church's claims; and, in the former case, the Church must only pursue her demand for the remainder. “Union,” “perseverance,” “temperance,” and “hope,” should be the great practical guides of the Church. There is no reason whatever why the Church of England should not obtain her ends, like all other religious communities in the empire. The real cause of the continuance of practical evils is the want of *prudent action*. Men sit in their studies, and write pamphlets, or put forth articles in magazines, journals, or reviews; and do nothing more. Then they become impatient and angry, or dispirited, when they find that their pamphlets or their articles have not produced the removal of the defects or the evils which they have pointed out. They forget that the bishops have not the power of *compelling* the minister to advise the Crown to give licence to convocation to deliberate on Church subjects. They forget that their pamphlets and articles are never heard of within the walls of Parliament, nor perused, perhaps, by any statesman or member of the House of Commons: and they forget that, in the present state of things, unless an

impression be made in the *House of Commons*,—unless its attention is called to the claims of the Church, and unless there are members who will *speak* in behalf of these claims,—there is no reasonable prospect of influencing a ministry or the legislature.

Now, if all those who are continually complaining and mourning over the defects in our system were, instead of contenting themselves with mere *words*, to set in earnest and practically to the work of promoting improvement, in the way which is plainly open to them, that is, by the exercise of the right of petition, and by employing all the means in their power for influencing those persons who are likely to have weight in the decisions of matters affecting the Church, they would be employed in a way which would be, we can assure them, useful to the Church, and satisfactory to themselves.

What we now want is, not mere speculation, but ACTION. The Church is, as a body, fully aware of her wants, and her defects, and her dangers. The only question is, How are we to proceed for the purpose of providing for the one, and removing the others? We recommend the Church to follow the example, as far as she may, of all the sects and communities in the empire, which have gained concessions from the State during the last fifty years. We do not counsel agitation, or ill-feeling, turbulent expressions, extravagant claims, or any thing else which would be unworthy of the Christian character of the Church of England, or inconsistent with the respect due to constituted authorities, or with the union of Church and State. We do not recommend the assertion of high claims or principles to those who would look on them as mere folly and extravagance. But at the same time we think that churchmen ought never to forget that the Church has interests of the highest and most sacred kind confided to her; that she is responsible for the purity of faith, and for the salvation of the souls within her communion; that she is bound to see that every means is employed for the sanctification of her members; and that her clergy (more especially those who are the sources of ecclesiastical authority, and the leaders of the clergy and people) should be holy, devoted, Christian men. This is the *immediate* duty of the Church; it is not the immediate duty of the State: in fact, its obligation on the State in any way is every day more and more denied. The State is openly denied by politicians to have any conscience in such matters. It has no such responsibility, according to the prevalent opinion of statesmen. If this, then, be the case, it is more than ever necessary for the Church, from its highest members downwards, to look simply to the welfare of religion; to look to it in the first place; disregarding the wishes of this or that political party, or this or that statesman.

The time has now passed by for the Church to ally herself with any particular party—so, at least, as to place any dependence upon it. We would see her now preserve amicable relations with all, as far as she may; and resist any, whenever she is called to do so by duty. To support any particular ministry, or to wish for the success of any particular party, would now be a mistake in the Church. If there ever be again any consistent political party, or any firm government, it can only be by creating a new party, of which there is little prospect. The *restrictive* principle, however connected with all that was noble, high-minded, and religious, is worn out; it has been so often betrayed by its professed defenders, that it is exhausted. The cause is a permanently losing one. Let the Church adopt the *constructive* principle, and her cause will become the winning one. She will be able to retrieve everything in the end, if she will *advance her own claims*, and persevere till they are gained. Let her continue her protest against bad legislation; but let her seek to turn the current of legislation to her own advantage. The mode of appointing bishops is a question which should be *temperately and fully discussed*. No exaggerated claims should be made; but fair and reasonable securities, which the law does not at present provide, should be sought. The Minister of the Crown is now invested with *arbitrary* power; he may obtrude on the Church any one that he pleases; and the Church is thus placed in danger of decided *collisions* with the ministry of the day. Surely some mode ought to be devised for altering a law which is found to work thus unsatisfactorily; and for reforming a system which interferes by compulsion with the conscientious convictions of the heads of the Church.

In conclusion, we would again most earnestly press on the Church, to lose no time in petitioning for a large extension of the Episcopate, and for securities for the appointment of faithful, pious, laborious men as bishops. It may be, that if the voice of the Church be not heard loudly and unitedly in assertion of her claims, the *enemies of Religion* will avail themselves of the excitement to attempt aggressive measures against the Church; and a movement, which ought to have been an advance, may become a retreat, or a failure. Therefore, we say, let no time be lost in *pressing forwards* the claims of the Church, in such a shape as is least calculated to excite hostility and opposition.

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. Mrs. Montgomery's Poems. 2. Olshausen's Commentary on the Gospels, translated by Dr. Loewe. 3. Dr. Fullwood's Roma ruit; a new edition. 4. Malan's Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. 5. Goodwin's Anglo-Saxon Version of the Life of St. Guthlac, Hermit of Crowland. 6. Schneider's German and English Dictionary. 7. Dr. Giles's History of the Ancient Britons. 8. Sweet's Religious Liberty. 9. Keble's Sermons. 10. Corrie's History of the Reformation—Massingberd's English Reformation. 11. Dr. Townsend's Ecclesiastical and Civil History philosophically considered. 12. Posthumous Works of Dr. Chalmers. 13. Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age. 14. Sermons by Ogilvie, Vaughan, and Woolley. 15. Sermons by Puckle, Dow, and Russell. 16. Montgomery's Religion and Poetry. 17. Marriage with a deceased Wife's Sister, by Denham. 18. Tracts on the Secession of Mr. Chirol from the Church of England.

I.—*Poems.* By Mrs. ALFRED MONTGOMERY. London: Rivingtons. 1846.

“THE smallness of a book,” said Myles Davies, “is always its own commendation, as on the contrary the largeness of a book is its own disadvantage, as well as terrour of learning.” Our learning has received due assurance from the size of Mrs. Alfred Montgomery's volume, but we verily believe we could have forgiven a royal 8vo. from the hand of the accomplished authoress of “Truth without Prejudice.”

Being addicted to the reading of Poetry, and relying perhaps overmuch on the doctrine above enunciated, we have lately been wasting some valuable time in the profitless and disappointing labour of turning the pages, and endeavouring to cull the beauties of sundry small tomes of “Poems” so called, in blank verse and in rhyme, by authors and authoresses, amateur as well as professional. The muse seems to have sunk with consols, and if there be no better paper in the market than the greater part of that which has met our eye, we cannot be surprised at the difficulty of obtaining discounts. The following may be taken as a choice sample of the result of our researches:—

“ON FIRST SEEING C—— M—— ACT AT BRIGHTON.

“M——s, thy varied powers of speech  
Would rouse the very dead; (!)  
To sit unmoved, and hear thee speak  
One must be made of lead.

" They tell me your's is acting,  
And it truly may be so,—  
But *of one thing I am certain*  
*It is impossible to know. (!)*

• • • • •

" Oh ! it is nothing artificial,  
No gesture overdone ;  
You speak your part with such an ease  
That *acting* there is *none*.

• • • • •

" I glory in my countryman,  
And have a pride to see  
That while all foreign things are praised,  
*It is British blood in thee.*"

Animated by the patriotic sentiment we ought not, we suppose, to pause in doubt as to the grammatical construction, or even the real meaning of this spirited stanza.

" Then like a Garrick thou shalt live  
When kings have passed away :  
Thy name is written on a *rock*  
That *never* shall *decay*."

Mr. Barry and Messrs. Grissel and Peto would be glad doubtless to know the whereabouts of that "rock."

Not lightly, we know, is the task of criticizing *true* poetry to be undertaken. It is related of the great Samuel Clarke, that being fond of robust exercise, he was once surprised in the act of leaping over his chairs by the entrance of a pedantic fellow ; " Now," he said, " we must desist, for a fool is coming in." Still more cautious should we be of wounding feelings, or possibly blighting prospects, where the struggle has been not for fame so much as for bread. The works then to which we have referred shall be nameless ; and we will vent our spleen in the not very uncharitable wish that they may meet with many purchasers, and that their leaves may never be cut.

Mrs. Alfred Montgomery's poems are of a different caste. We are not, indeed, dazzled by the fire of genius giving to us, as it burns, bright, though fitful, gleams into the world of the ideal ; nor in reading them do we feel held, as in a vice, by the strong grasp of a commanding intellect : they do not aim at the supernatural altitudes, the spells and talismans of " Thalaba," or " Curse of Kehama ;" an attempt, the result of which to any but a Southey, would probably be that " his head as he tumbled" would go " nickety nock like a pebble in Carisbrook Well."

Neither in ~~the~~ ~~interest~~ in the more childishness, the didactic placitudes which sometimes give but too easy a handle to the servile imitations in the one hand, as well as the detractors on the other, of an eminent and venerable poet, whose cast-off stockings and small-clothes have been worn by so many—whose ~~name~~ ~~has~~ ~~fallen~~ in tone. They are simply verses of occasion—thoughts and feelings which have escaped at intervals from a warm heart, and a sensitive as well as highly-cultivated and religiously-toned mind. They are, speaking generally, the type of what is passing in the breast of most of the high-bred daughters of England, but which Mrs. Montgomery possesses the more peculiar faculty of clothing in the garb of graceful and harmonious verse. There is in her poems much of apt imagery, and elegance of expression; though we have to find fault with not infrequent instances of carelessness, and would recommend a more diligent attention to minutiae, to the dots and crosses of her compositions.

Full of religious beauty are the following lines:—

“ WE GIVE THANKS TO THEE FOR THY GREAT  
GLORY.”

(COMMUNION SERVICE.)

“ The Sunbeams write Thy glory in the sky  
In red and gold :  
And ev’ry ray the dew-drops multiply  
A thousand-fold.

“ The stars hang up their shining lamps above  
To show Thy Name ;  
And trace on Heaven’s blue tablet words of love  
In deathless flame.

“ The winds have bid it echo every where  
O’er land and seas,  
In the wild tempest’s howl, the sultry air,  
And evening breeze.

“ The sea-birds hear its deep and solemn tone  
On Ocean’s waves,  
Where Nature’s pious hands have rear’d her own  
Cathedral caves.

“ With morning’s earliest blush the lark is heard  
Her hymn to raise :  
And e’en the chilly night hath one lone bird  
To chant Thy praise.



" But we have higher themes :—The Cross, the Grave,  
Shall swell our songs :  
The love that stoop'd to death and died to save  
To us belongs.

" The full-toned voice of Nature speaks Thy great  
Creative powers ;  
But mercy that could reach man's ruin'd state  
Is only our's.

" Oh bliss ! that love and peace thus closely can  
Together meet,  
In perfect pledge that nought Redemption's plan  
Shall e'er defeat.

" With Nature then we join, and still rejoice  
In hymns of peace,  
Which in accord with her true constant voice  
Shall never cease."

The use of "*bid*" as a participle *may* be *vernacular*, but is *carcely* correct.

We like " Reality: "—

" Ye all are gone, false dreams of youth,  
False visions of unclouded days,  
And step by step slow-pacing truth  
Sweeps the vain pageants from my gaze.

" Slowly, but oh ! not sadly now,  
I quit the height where once I stood,  
Take the bright chaplet from my brow,  
And travel on in lowlier mood.

" Two solemn lessons, long and deep,  
At last this wayward heart shall know,  
And learn an even course to keep,  
More grave in joy, more calm in woe.

" The keenest grief that kills the rest  
Is worse while dreaded than when here ;  
The deepest joy that swells the breast  
Is never left without a tear.

" The path of life is stern and real  
E'en when in happy scenes 'tis cast,  
And slaves of fears and hopes ideal  
Will find their life a dream at last."

The verses "For Music" are pretty and Wordsworthian:—

"She was a Thing of love and light,  
A being scarce of earth,  
Her eye so clear, her form so slight,  
Her ringing laugh of mirth;—  
It haunts me still,—that clust'ring hair,  
The radiance of her smile,  
The winning look that linger'd there,  
Half love, half playful guile.

"Yet on her brow you oft might trace  
A shade of thoughtful woe,  
As summer clouds that darkly chase,  
The sun's bright gleam below.  
A pensive tone, which interest lent  
To all she did or said,  
Most like a flower with dark leaves bent  
To hide its own bright head."

The close recurrence of the epithet "deep" in the former stanzas, and the complementary insertion of "most" in the last line but one of the latter, would have been avoided by more searching revision.

"Behold her as she passes by" and "Passing Pleasure" are excellent, but our space will only permit us to make one more extract from some truthfully tender lines, entitled,

"'THOU HAST NOT LOVED AS I HAVE LOVED.'

"Thou hast not loved as I have loved,  
Thy love is calm tho' deep,  
The quiet beatings of a heart  
Whose passions are asleep.  
Thou art affectionate and kind  
Where I am weakly fond,  
Thy gentle service is a gift,  
But mine a captive's bond.

"And when we part, thy manly breast  
No vain regrets can fill,  
Thy voice tho' sad is calm and firm,  
Thy pulse beats even still.  
But when I see thee turn away,  
Some vague foreboding pain  
Thrills with wild horror thro' my soul,  
We ne'er shall meet again.

“ And when the hour of thy return  
Is drawing near and near,  
My life appears to ebb away,  
With blank suspense and fear.  
And yet to thee it seems most strange  
If but one brief embrace  
Should fail to make me smile again,  
And ev’ry tear efface.

• • • • •

“ But be it so ! I will not ask  
That thou should’st love like me ;  
To thee be that deep joy unknown,  
And deeper agony !  
Give me thy firm and constant faith  
And thou hast done thy part,  
And in return accept and keep  
This too devoted heart !”

Mrs. Montgomery must remember, that, from the nature of its subjects, the style of poetry which she has adopted, is ordinarily considered to represent in some degree what has passed, or is passing in the mind of the writer ; let her beware lest she allow feeling to degenerate into a sentiment ; let her not fritter away the force of an idea by too much expansion ; let her revise, and, when necessary, not hesitate to expunge ; and we will venture to assure her, that, though she may fail to astonish, she will always please ; though she may not found a school, or lead a sect, she will yet be an honoured and a trusted teacher.

With these few words of friendly warning and advice, we take leave of a book which has given real enjoyment and apparent speed to the passage of a leisure hour, and which has borne evidence to the truth of what has been said by a distinguished modern writer, that “ the genius of women loves best to image forth good, for ’tis the blessing of their life, its power, and its glory ; and hence, when they write poetry, it is religious, sweet, soft, solemn, and divine.”

II.—*Biblical Commentary on the Gospels.* By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated from the German by Dr. SERGIUS LOEWE. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1847. [Foreign Theological Library, vol. v.]

A wish must have been often felt, and has sometimes been publicly expressed, that Olshausen’s very valuable Commentary on the New Testament might be rendered accessible to English

readers in general. We have, indeed, heard that a translation had been actually commenced by some members of our own Church, when another was announced as about to appear in the "Foreign Theological Library;" a series undertaken by an Edinburgh bookselling firm, in rivalry of those publishing societies which send forth substantial octavo volumes at the rate of five shillings each.

The low price of Messrs. Clark's publication must, we apprehend, render any attempt at competition with it a matter of certain loss, such as it is not reasonable to expect that any one will choose to encounter. We must, therefore, regret, in a degree proportioned to our high admiration of the original work, that the only English Olshausen which we are likely to see is so exceedingly ill executed as to be utterly untrustworthy, and almost useless.

Dr. Loewe, who appears to be a teacher at Manchester, tells us in his preface (p. viii.), that the nature of the book "would have deterred any one but a native of Germany from entering upon the task of rendering it into another language." If these words are meant to imply the general proposition, that a German has an advantage over an Englishman as the translator of such a work, we must venture to differ from Dr. Loewe: for, in order to translation, a knowledge of *two* languages is required; and we should suppose it more likely that an Englishman would be able to discover the author's meaning than that a German could express it sufficiently to English readers.

It so happens, however, that the defects of the work before us are different from those which we should have expected to meet with in a version executed by a foreigner. The style of the preface, indeed, is abundantly un-English; but that of the body of the book, although extremely clumsy and perplexed, does not appear to be marked, in any great degree, by foreign peculiarities. And, on the other hand, our chief objection to the translation is not founded on any matter of style or expression; presumptuous as it may seem in an English reviewer to advance such a charge against "a native of Germany," we say without hesitation that Dr. Loewe does not understand his author<sup>1</sup>. Our opinion has been formed from an examination of many passages; and, by way of specimen, we shall now produce one of these—the opening of the remarks on our Lord's temptation. (Olshausen, 3rd ed. i. 177; Transl. i. 182.)

<sup>1</sup> The circumstance here mentioned suggests a suspicion that the translation may really have been made, not by Dr. Loewe, but by his pupils in German. But we do not care to follow out this conjecture; the main question is, not *by whom*, but *how*, the work has been done.

" *In most perfect accordance* with the preparation of our Redeemer by his endowment with the fullness of the Spirit, does his victory in his struggle with the evil one present itself. The idea of the Messiah implies his being called *into existence* for the destruction of the kingdom of darkness; hence his whole life on earth appears to be a struggle with the prince of darkness; yet the Gospel-history *points out two events only* in the life of Jesus, wherein He resisted the full combined power of the evil spirit, and overcame it. These momentous events form the beginning and the end of his public ministry, and both of them display their peculiar character. In the first temptation, at the very entrance upon his office, enticement presented itself to our Lord in the form of *sensual* pleasure; and in the second, at the end of his earthly career, it was through the fear of sufferings and death. *Each of these temptations presents itself in a varied form*: in the uniform victory over both we behold our Lord as the ideal of consummate righteousness, as victor in the struggle against sin."

Now we beg our reader, *first*, to ask himself whether he can make any consistent sense of this extract; and, whatever the answer to that question may be, *secondly*, to compare it (especially the words marked by italics) with the following, which we believe to be a more accurate, although by no means a perfect, rendering of the passage. It will be seen that we have not been solicitous to avoid Dr. Loewe's words, as we are not now criticizing his diction, but his understanding of the original.

"The equipment<sup>2</sup> of the Redeemer with the fullness of the Spirit is most appositely followed by his probation in conflict with evil<sup>3</sup>. It is implied in the idea of the Messiah, that He is called to destroy the kingdom of darkness; hence his whole life on earth appears as a contest with the prince of darkness: but the Gospel history gives prominence to two points in the life of Jesus, in which He withstood the full concentrated power of evil, and overcame it. These points form the beginning and the end of his public ministry, and have each a special character of its own. In the first temptation, immediately at his entrance on his office, the Redeemer was assailed by enticement through *desire*; in the other, at the end of his earthly ministry, by *fear* of suffering and death. Every temptation exhibits itself in one or the other of these forms: in his victory over both alike, our Lord appears as the ideal of perfect righteousness, as victor in the contest against sin."

This sample, which has been taken quite accidentally, may serve to show that the portion of the work which is entrusted to Dr. Loewe must be a grievous misrepresentation of the original,

<sup>2</sup> *Ausstattung*. "Equipment" is an awkward word, but nothing better occurs to us. Dr. Loewe's "endowment" alters the image.

<sup>3</sup> It appears better, on a consideration of the whole passage, to take "dem Bösen" as neuter, "evil"—than as masculine, "the evil one."

and of very little use to English readers. If the translator of the Commentary on the Acts and Epistles should perform his task in a more satisfactory manner, he must suffer much from the connexion with this wretched mangling of the earlier portion.

A Mr. Fairbairn and a Mr. Thomson, who have translated Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms for the same series, are worthy to be associated with Dr. Loewe. The scantiness of their acquaintance with German is sufficiently exposed by the curious list of errata which some good-natured friend has prefixed to their second volume. They have shown themselves incapable of rendering the most common idioms into the corresponding English; and it is really impossible to understand their production, without the help of the original.

We are happy to say that Dr. Davison, the translator of Gieseler's Church History, and Mr. Buck, the translator of Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, have acquitted themselves much more creditably.

P.S. Since our notice was sent to the press, we have been informed that Dr. Loewe has been superseded, and that the first volume of the commentary is to be re-translated. Messrs. Clark deserve credit for their conduct in the matter; and we trust that something like justice will now be done to Olshausen.

III.—ROMA RUIT. *The Pillars of Rome are broken; wherein all the several pleas for the Pope's authority in England, with all the material defences of them, as they have been urged by the Romanists from the beginning of our Reformation to this day, are revised and answered, by FR. FULLWOOD, D.D., Archdeacon of Totnes in Devon. A new Edition revised by CHARLES HARDWICK, M.A., Fellow of St. Catharine's Hall, Cambridge. London: J. W. Parker. Cambridge: Deighton, 8vo. pp. 334.*

CONSIDERING that the Romanists of this country are said to be about so far to tax the endurance of England, as to give English titles to their foreign bishops, we cannot but regard a new edition of Dr. Fullwood's work as being very seasonable. Our readers are doubtless aware, that notwithstanding the palpably foreign aspect of the whole system of Romanism in this country, the upholders of that system are accustomed to put forward certain pleas to justify, if it may be, their schismatical position among us. These pleas, indeed, vary according to the purpose to be served, and the occasion that offers, and are self-contradictory when brought into juxta-position with each other; but as few persons



have the leisure or opportunity for examining the whole body of evidence bearing on the papal claims to jurisdiction in this land, a well-digested text-book on that subject cannot fail to be of service. It is for this reason that we recommend to the theological student this work of Dr. Fullwood; for we know of no other work of the same extent, and on the same subject, which for comprehensiveness, lucid arrangement of matter, and cogency of argument, will bear comparison with it. Our limits will not, however, do more than admit of the following very brief outline of this remarkable book.

After defining schism, and proving Romanists in this country to be justly chargeable with that sin, Dr. Fullwood proceeds to examine the several claims to jurisdiction which the advocates of the papal usurpations are accustomed to put forward. The claims urged are made to rest on (1) Conversion; (2) Patriarchal rights; (3) Prescription; (4) Infallibility; (5) an Universal Pastorship. These pleas Dr. Fullwood accordingly examines, and refutes with a clearness and succinctness peculiarly his own; and then demands, on behalf of the Church of England:—

“If the pope have no right to govern the Church of England, as our Apostle, or Patriarch, or as Infallible: if his supremacy over us was never grounded in, but ever renounced by our laws and customs, and the very constitution of the kingdom; if his supremacy be neither of civil, ecclesiastical, or divine right: if it be disowned by the Scriptures and Fathers, and condemned by the ancient Councils, the essential profession of the present Romish Church, and the solemn oaths of the Bishops of Rome themselves;—if, I say, all be certainly so as hath appeared, what reason remains for the necessity of the Church of England's readmission of, or submission to, the papal authority, usurped contrary to all this? Or what reason is left to charge us with schism for rejecting it?”—pp. 294, 295.

The learned author concludes by showing:—

“That as the claim of the pope's authority cannot be allowed, so there is cause enough otherwise of our denial of obedience actually to it, from reasons inherent in the usurpation itself, and the nature of many things required by his laws.”—*Ibid.*

We would only add, that the value of this unanswerable work has been greatly enhanced by the care and learning bestowed upon it by the Editor. Besides giving the original authorities at length, to which Dr. Fullwood merely refers, Mr. Hardwick has added much important matter illustrative and confirmatory of the several questions discussed by the Author. We would especially direct attention to an Appendix in pp. 314 et seq.

IV.—*A Plain Exposition of the Apostles' Creed, in Questions and Answers.* By the Rev. S. C. MALAN, M.A. Vicar of Broadwindsor, Dorset. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1847.

THE object of this very unpretending little volume is clearly set forth in the Introduction:—

“Among the many publications of the kind there are some which, although full of merit, must appear too long or too deep for uncultivated minds: while others of smaller compass, are either not explicit enough, or written in a style not always adapted to the understanding of those for whom they were intended. Thus it may be that some parish priest who labours in earnest to train his people in the doctrine of our Church will have felt the want of a plain and practical exposition of our Creed suited to the capacity of the younger members of his flock. The following pages are an humble attempt at supplying this deficiency. They form the substance of a course of instruction given at different times to the older children of a Sunday School, and also to a class of adults, as part of the regular teaching of the Church Catechism.”

To say that Mr. Malan has entirely succeeded would be untrue; to say that he has failed would be equally unfair. He has not entirely succeeded in the *very difficult* task he has undertaken, for there are here and there oversights, though few of any moment.

In spite, however, of occasional faults, the working clergy will find this book of very great use in many ways. It furnishes them with a magazine of texts for the most part well chosen and well arranged. His teaching on all vital questions, while strictly orthodox, is free from the party watchwords which so often render works of the kind perfectly useless and even mischievous. And the style is throughout of that simple, loving, earnest description which finds its way to the heart. Take the following passage:—

“Q. How are we required to believe them?—A. With the heart really and truly, ‘For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.’ Romans x. 10; Acts viii. 37.

“Q. What is it to believe with the heart?—A. It is to feel what we believe.—Q. Explain what you mean.—A. For instance, if I believe in God with the heart, as I believe that He is, so also I fear and obey Him: and if I believe in JESUS CHRIST with the heart, while I believe that He is the SON of GOD, the SAVIOUR, I love and follow Him as such.

“Q. Do all Christians believe alike with the heart unto salvation?—A. No. We see that many believe in God, who neither fear nor obey Him: and that many say they believe in JESUS CHRIST the Saviour, who care not to do what He commands.

“ Q. There seem then to be two kinds of faith?—A. Yes : namely, the *living faith* and the *dead faith*.

“ Q. What is *Living Faith*?—A. Faith *with* works.

“ Q. What is *Dead Faith*?—A. Faith without works.

“ Q. What do you mean by ‘ Faith with works ?’

“ A. Faith that shows itself in good works wrought by the HOLY GHOST, which always follow true faith in the heart ; like a tree that bears good fruit.”

The remainder of the passage is too long to quote in a notice like the present. It proves the truth of the former answers by texts of Scripture.

Take, again, the following :—

“ Q. Where is God?—A. Everywhere. In heaven above, and in the earth beneath, God is ‘ all in all,’ and by Him all things consist, ‘ seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things.’ Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2 ; Col. i. 16 ; Acts xvii. 25. 28 ; Ps. cxxxix. 7. 12.—Can you see Him?—A. No. ‘ No man hath seen God at any time.’ St. John i. 18.—Q. How then do you believe that He is?—A. Because,

although I do not see Him, every thing around me shows me that there is a God ; and in the Bible I learn for certain to know who He is.

—Q. What do you mean by saying that every thing around shows you that there is a God?—A. When, for instance, I see the sun give light by day, and the moon and stars shine by night, and when I see the rain fall, the trees bud, bright flowers blow, and wheat ripen for harvest, I say to myself, These things cannot have made themselves ; some one wiser and greater than they must have ordered them, and that One is God. And when I see the cattle of the field, the birds of the air, and every living thing kept in life and satisfied with food, I again say to myself, Some one, both great and good, must provide for all these, and that One is God.

“ Q. But are men expected to notice these things, and to see God in them ?

“ A. Yes, verily ; for ‘ God hath not left Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.’ Acts xiv. 17.

“ ‘ Because that which may be known of God is manifest to men ; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead ; so that they are without excuse.’ Rom. i. 19, 20.

“ ‘ But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee ; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee : or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee ; and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. Who knoweth not in all these, that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this.’ Job xii. 7—9 ; xxxvii. 14.”—pp. 9, 10.

A great omission, however, occurs in treating of the fifth Article, where the descent into Hades is passed over in silence :

in the same section there is a mistake, also a very common, but a very dangerous one, as to the meaning of the phrase "imputed to him for righteousness." We were rather surprised at the interpretation of Rom. xiv. 23, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." But we will not add more than the expression of our opinion, that this little work will be found really useful by all who are engaged in the important work of catechizing.

v.—*The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Life of St. Guthlac, Hermit of Crowland. Now first printed from a MS. in the Cottonian Library, with a Translation and Notes. By CHARLES WYCLIFFE GOODWIN, M.A., Fellow of Catherine Hall, Cambridge.*

THIS volume may be regarded in a twofold aspect, either as a contribution to Anglo-Saxon literature, or as a contemporary picture of Anglo-Saxon religion. In both respects it is extremely interesting, and well worth the perusal of every one who would cultivate a closer acquaintance with our national antiquities. The interest has been rendered, in the present case, more widely communicable by the insertion of a translation on the alternate pages; while for the special benefit of the Anglo-Saxon student, sundry rules and illustrations are appended, all indicating careful research; and, in many cases, supplying peculiarities of grammar unnoticed by Rask or Bosworth.

Of the biography itself different estimates will of course be formed, according to the differences of the minds to which it is presented. Some will see in it the description of an earnest, but ill-informed piety; others, perhaps, will at once reject it as a tissue of monkish fables. No one we think can question but that the Anglo-Saxon, as well as the Egyptian hermit-saints, very often impaired, both their own understanding, and the integrity of the Christian faith, through their habits of unnatural austerity; yet, on the other hand, it can hardly be denied, that there is stamped upon much which is superstitious, a singular simplicity and fervour. Again, while some, like Fursey and Brighthelm, of Melrose, withdrew from this world and all its comforts to dream only of that which is to come; others combined activity with contemplation, and girded themselves, not only to combat foul fiends (the *ignes fatui* of their favourite morasses), but also to promote the influence of the Gospel among their rude and still heathenish neighbours.

St. Guthlac will be found to have in him far less of the missionary than of the anchorite; and, accordingly, his life contains fewer incidents of an ordinary, and more of a preternatural, complexion. His birth, attended by prodigies, gave promise of a

distinguished personage (p. 13). He was not "addicted to boyish levities, nor the vain talk of vulgar men, nor unseemly fawning, nor lying flattery. *Nor did he study the various cries of birds, as childish age is often wont*" (p. 13). No sooner, however, had he grown up to manhood, than the hopes of his friends were painfully disappointed. "As though he had woke from sleep" (p. 15), his disposition was totally changed; he sallied forth as a knightly marauder, and became lawless and revengeful, like too many of his contemporaries. "It was about nine years that he was thus engaged in hostile raids [*lit.*, in persecution], the blessed Guthlac, and he thus wandered amidst the tumult of this present world" (p. 15). Compunction naturally succeeded to cruelty, and at the age of twenty-four, Guthlac became "suddenly excited with godly fear; he forsook all the pomps of the world, and set all his hope on Christ" (p. 17). The first place to which he retired was the monastery of Repton (*Hrypādūn*), at that time, under a certain *abbess*, *Ælfthrytha*. After two years' study, "he had learned his psalms and canticles, and hymns and prayers, according to ecclesiastical order" (p. 19). "Cultivating the virtues of all good men" (*ibid.*). Still, this kind of seclusion did not satisfy the cravings of his spirit. "When he heard tell and learned concerning anchorites, who of yore longed for the wilderness and hermitages for God's name; and passed their lives there, his heart was inwardly inspired with the love of God to long for the wilderness" (p. 19). Accordingly, he set out in search of a most inhospitable fen, and fixed his dwelling at a spot called Crowland, which "no man ever could inhabit before the holy man Guthlac came thither, on account of the dwelling of the accursed spirits there" (p. 23). For the subsequent incidents of his life, his repeated victories over evil spirits, his predictions, miracles, and the rest, we must refer to the biography itself. He died fifteen years after his settlement at Crowland. His character is summed up in the following encomium: "The blessed man Guthlac was a chosen man in divine deeds, and a treasure of all wisdom; and he was steadfast in his duties, as also he was earnestly intent on Christ's service, so that never was aught else in his mouth but Christ's praise, nor in his heart but virtue, nor in his mind but praise, and love, and piety."

Before closing this notice, we would recommend other members of the University of Cambridge to work the same extensive mine which Mr. Goodwin has here opened. The libraries of that University are particularly rich in the theological remains of Anglo-Saxon literature, so that he who will sift and edit them, may not only be furthering the study of his own language, but may be employing his ability, as did Parker, and Twysden, and Wheloc, in the illustration and defence of his own Church.

VI.—*A Complete Pocket Dictionary of the German and English Languages for Travellers and Students; compiled with especial regard to Pronunciation and Accentuation, after the principles of Heinsius and Walker. By F. W. C. SCHNEIDER. London: Williams and Norgate, 1847.*

WE are not aware what helps the Germans may have, in the way of pocket dictionaries, for the acquisition of the English language; but for English students of the German tongue a work like that now offered to the public, at once compendious and complete, has long been a desideratum. As a repertory of the words of both languages, it will be found much fuller than the general run of pocket dictionaries; while the different meanings of each word are carefully enumerated and judiciously arranged. The addition, throughout, of the pronunciation marks of Walker, in the English, and of the accents of Heinsius in the German part, is most valuable, considering the difficulties attending a correct pronunciation of both the languages. Another distinctive feature of the present dictionary is, the insertion of the terms in use in that new branch of human speech, the phraseology of rail-roads. We can imagine the comfort it must be to a man, travelling, as any body now does and must travel, by rail, to know that he carries in his pocket a key to all the laconic intimations which railway companies convey to their passengers, both orally and in writing. At the same time we advise him to be quick in turning over his pages, else he may find himself left behind on the platform, with Schneider's dictionary in his hand, and sundry quizzing faces making unkindly response to his own woe-begone countenance. That, however, will be his own fault, and not that of the present dictionary, the arrangements of which are remarkably clear and distinct, and the type, especially the German, though necessarily small, very neat and pleasing to the eye. A copious list of proper names, including geographical names, and a well-digested table of the irregular verbs, is appended to each part. Altogether the work is such as to recommend itself to the public, to whose gratitude and support both the compiler and the publishers have entitled themselves, by the supply of so useful an article at so moderate a price.

VII.—*History of the Ancient Britons, from the Earliest Period to the Invasion of the Saxons. Compiled from the Original Documents. By the Rev. J. A. GILES, D.C.L., &c. London: Bell.*

THE object of this work is to collect together all the notices which the classical and other writers supply in reference to the history of Britain from the earliest period till the Conquest by the Anglo-Saxons. The plan pursued by Dr. Giles is, to relate the events of the history as far as possible in the very words of the



contemporary historians, or of those who lived the nearest to the time. That this plan is not in accordance with the usual plan of composing history—that it is not favourable to the development of what are called philosophical views, or to the exercise of criticism, may be admitted; but the plan is certainly calculated to give a character of reality and life to the narrative, which, perhaps, cannot be more effectually attained. The early history is of course largely indebted to Cæsar and Tacitus.

Dr. Giles, in rejecting some of the legends concerning the conversion of Britain to Christianity, observes that it is absurd to suppose that the Roman emperors in the second century “would co-operate either for good or bad with the obscure individuals, who at that time called themselves bishops of Rome,” and remarks as an illustration of the early history of the Church, that, “we have witnessed in *our own times*, a singular burst of human weakness and delusion in the formation of the sect commonly called Irvingites; with *pretensions* to miraculous power *not inferior to those of the first Christians*, they united meekness of conduct and humbleness of life equally remarkable and striking.”—p. 213.

The tone in which Dr. Giles speaks of controversies of the highest importance is contemptuous. In allusion to the controversy on Pelagianism, he says, that it was “only felt on the surface of society. The monks and clergy, who pass their lives in the contemplation of such questions, will always be roused by an attempt to *disturb the modes of belief which are the axioms of their profession*, but the people at large took little part in a dispute which was above their comprehension.”—p. 362.

These few remarks and specimens of Dr. Giles's style will prepare the reader to find his work rather the composition of a philosopher than of a Christian; the reverend author is evidently anxious to free himself as much as possible from all the prejudices of the “*sacerdotal caste*,” to which he unfortunately belongs.

Notwithstanding this, his work, as a record of facts, is not without its value. He justly appreciates the historical value of many of the facts which have been obtruded on the unwary reader by monkish romance; but he is still unable to see through them all. For instance, the story of King Lucius, who is said to have reigned in Britain in the latter part of the second century. The accounts given of the alleged conversion of this imaginary prince by Bede and Nennius are examined by Dr. Giles, and shown to be full of gross anachronisms, contradictions, and absurdities. Lucius is said to have addressed a letter to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, requesting to be “made a Christian,” to which Eleutherius acceded, and the Britons from that time became and continued Christians. The great difficulty in

this story is, that although the events to which it refers are said to have happened about A.D. 160, we do not hear of them till the time of Bede, who wrote about A.D. 730. Nor is there any other evidence of the existence of Lucius; for, as Mr. Pant'n remarks in his elaborate and excellent edition of Bishop Stillingfleet's "*Origines Britannicæ*," the two coins of King Lucius, which Archbishop Ussher referred to in proof of the existence of that monarch, do not afford any evidence—the one being a manifest forgery, and the other being lost; besides which, as Dr. Giles observes, the money current in the Roman provinces was coined in the Roman mint, and never bore the heads of the tributary chieftains who were in subjection to the Roman authority. Moreover, there is obviously a *reason* for the invention of this story in the time of Bede. The native Britons and Irish who resisted the authority of the Saxon archbishops, and the regulations of the Church of Rome, were more likely to yield obedience to the latter if they could be persuaded that Christianity had come to them from *Rome*. In an age when the spurious decretals were forged, and in a work which abounds with fabulous and incredible legends like that of Venerable Bede, it need not excite any surprise that a story like that of King Lucius should have been received by Bede without inquiry. And from his pages it was copied, with augmentations, by every successive writer. It is morally impossible that Venerable Bede should have been the first person to allude to this story *five hundred and seventy years* after the time, if it had been really founded in fact. How is it to be explained that Gregory the Great in his letters to St. Augustine never alluded to the fact? nor any of the popes, his predecessors, or his successors, until the time of Venerable Bede? We have not the slightest doubt or hesitation in rejecting the whole story as a mere fabrication of the eighth century.

The second volume of Dr. Giles's work comprises not the least valuable portion of it—all the original works, documents, and inscriptions from which his narrative is derived. On the whole, though we cannot approve the tone of his remarks on religious subjects, his work is one which is certainly deserving of a place in every English historical library.

VIII.—*Religious Liberty. The Church in Chains; being an Attempt to set forth the grounds upon which a number of the Clergy are at present associated, to obtain a Restoration of Corrective Discipline in the English Church.* By JAMES BRADBY SWEET, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of Woodville, Leicestershire.* London: Cleaver.

HERE are, doubtless, persons who will feel, in perusing the

painful disclosures of this tract, that a very serious injury has been done to the Church by its publication. It is, undoubtedly, shocking to every religious mind to read of the profanations which result from the present state of the law in regard to corrective discipline—independently of which, the absence of such discipline is, undoubtedly, a cause of much of the vice and immorality which prevails, and of the stupid insensibility to religion so often manifested. It will be impossible much longer to resist the call which is proceeding from so many quarters for the revival of discipline. Every thoughtful Christian, and every sincere member of the Church, must deplore the neglect into which it has fallen; and Dissent, Methodism, and Romanism, all profit by our negligence. We admit that there are difficulties in the way of reviving discipline as regards the laity. On one point we feel satisfied,—that the laity will not be satisfied to subject themselves merely to *clerical* tribunals. If discipline is revived, it *must* be administered with the aid of the laity themselves. Of course, from the Houses of Lords and Commons we need not expect much encouragement; nor, indeed, would it be desirable to seek for legislation *there* on so delicate a point. Convocation is the place from which discipline must emanate.

According to the view of the ecclesiastical law at present received by the ecclesiastical lawyers, a person who, after baptism, had solemnly renounced the Christian faith, and been received as a Mahomedan or a Jew, would, unless he had been excommunicated by some ecclesiastical court, be entitled to be buried with our service; and any clergyman refusing to do so, would be liable to suspension! This is a grievance, which can scarcely continue, if it be firmly and temperately urged upon persons in authority. We admit the practical difficulties, and the many evils which might arise, if every clergyman were permitted at pleasure to refuse interment to any person whom he might, perhaps unjustly, deem unfit for Christian burial. It would be impossible, without incurring risk to the welfare of religion, as well as to the feelings of survivors and relatives, to leave the decision to the judgment of each individual clergyman. But there is surely some middle course between this and enforcing the burial of persons with Christian rites who are really undeserving of them. The rites of the Church are properly for those of her own communion, at least not for those who die in a state of decided and notorious enmity to the Christian religion, or to its principal articles,—or in gross and open immorality. In the latter case, the scandal generally given to well-disposed people within the Church, and to Dissenters without it, is a positive and grave evil. We should deeply lament to see any arbitrary power in such matters given to the clergy individually,

because they might occasionally commit mistakes, which would be of the most injurious character to their ministry; but we think that some means ought to be found for enforcing corrective discipline. The Articles, Canons, and Rubrics, ought not to remain a dead letter, based as they are on the Word of God.

We think that in the revival of the synod in each rural deanery might be found some provision for the practical exercise of such corrective discipline. If some system could be devised, by which this synod should at once be invested with the gravity and authority which ought to attach to any judicial body, and, at the same time, obtain the full confidence of the laity as no mere instrument of "sacerdotal" power; it is possible that it might answer the desired purpose: but, in any case, some *local* tribunals ought to exist; for, to apply to the archdeacon's or the bishop's court, on all occasions, would be a great inconvenience.

We have been led into these speculations, for the moment, by the perusal of Mr. Sweet's pamphlet. We will not introduce quotations from his work, but merely state that it begins with a statement of the encouragement held out to Dissent by the present system, a review of the Scripture doctrine on the subject of Church discipline, a collection of cases of a revolting character in which the burial service has been used under the existing law, and in which its omission would have involved penalties; and extracts from episcopal charges, and the writings of distinguished persons, expressive of their feeling of the necessity of reform in our present laws.

We recommend the pamphlet in the strongest manner to all the clergy, not only for their own perusal, but for circulation amongst those laity who are desirous of restoring the vigour of the Church. It is a valuable aid to the cause of truth and holiness. No one can peruse this tract without a resolution to aid, as far as possible, in removing the disgraceful state of things which it records; and we feel convinced that it can and must be reformed before very long. The Church has it fully in her power to effect reforms of any abuses of this kind, if she will act on the legislature.

IX.—*Sermons, Academical and Occasional.* By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley, &c. Oxford: Parker.

ANY production from the pen of one to whom Religion is so deeply indebted as the author of the "Christian Year," must possess recommendations which supersede the necessity of any laudatory notices. The volume before us opens with a lengthened Preface "on the present position of the English Church," in which the principles laid down by Butler and Pascal in defend-

ing Christianity against unbelievers, are applied to meet some of the usual arguments by which persons are induced to forsake the English Church for Romanism. It would be impossible here to enter on all the particulars of the argument; and it will be found, perhaps, more adapted for the use of minds of a reflective and philosophical turn, than for the ordinary run of thinkers and reasoners. In one or two places, we have rather regretted to see a tone in reference to the position of our branch of the Church which we had hoped was now becoming extinct; we allude to that view which is taken of the Reformation as a thing to be ashamed of in some way—"The English deficiencies are quite confessed and palpable" to a romantic imaginative mind at least, while "the Roman claims stand out in a very obvious manner." And these opponents are supposed to dwell on our small number, our want of sanctity, and of definite doctrine, and to ask, "Who, if he could help it, would acknowledge such as the Tudor monarchs and their favourites, as framers in any sense of the religious system he lives under?" Now in reply to this, we think that a line is taken which has been too long tried, and found wanting. "Let it be *granted*, that we stand, *prima facie*, in a position more or less humiliating: I say that to acquiesce in it, because it is providentially our own position,—to be dutiful and loyal amid the full consciousness of it, savours of the same kind of generous contentment, in the not being ashamed of lowly parentage, nor unloving towards a dull monotonous home."—p. xxvi.

We notice this kind of view, because we feel it right to express dissent from a mode of speaking which has, we are persuaded, done harm, and which we do not wish to see countenanced by a writer so generally and so deservedly respected as Mr. Keble. But we should convey a most erroneous idea to the reader's mind, if the above expressions were supposed to be quoted as exemplifying the general spirit and tone of the Preface. It will be found to comprise much that is calculated to meet the sophistries of Romanism as applied to a peculiar class of minds; and we doubt not that the views therein propounded will retain some minds in communion with the Church, who have been unsettled by a system of teaching which is now at an end, and which will, we trust, never be revived in the Church of England.

The Sermons in this volume will be perused with much interest. They include specimens of the author's teaching from A.D. 1822 to 1846. Amongst those which possess the most historical interest, are the Sermons on "Natural Apostasy," preached at St. Mary's, in July 1833, immediately after the suppression of the Irish bishoprics, and of which the author there speaks in strong disapprobation; and the well-known Sermon on "Primitive Tradition recognized in Holy Scripture," published in 1836.

The following remarks, in a Sermon on the "Endurance of Church Imperfections," are addressed to those who might be tempted to leave the communion of the English Church:—

"It seems a providential circumstance, that the very forms which are said to be in use when English Catholics conform to the Church of Rome, are such as to bring before the mind the thought of many (to say the least) questionable things, which they, by so conforming, make entirely their own. Image-worship, for example, and the worship of the blessed Virgin and the Saints, are presented to the convert for his express sanction; and, of course, he is understood to sanction them, such as they avowedly exist, and are encouraged in that Church. Otherwise the mentioning them at all is either nugatory or deceptive."—p. 316.

x.—1. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, chiefly as abridged from the larger History by Bishop Burnet and his Son. Edited for the use of Students at the Universities, and Candidates for Holy Orders. By GEORGE E. CORRIE, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge; Norrisian Professor of Divinity, &c. London: J. W. Parker.*

2. *The English Reformation, by F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A., Rector of South Ormsby. Second Edition. London: J. W. Parker.*

THE latter of these works has been before the public for several years, and has acquired a considerable reputation. It may be safely recommended to young persons, as an accurate and faithful statement of the causes which led to the English Reformation, and of the various events which then took place; and it is composed on principles which render it a perfectly safe Manual for the use of young persons, which is more than can be said of many publications.

The first work, above-mentioned, is intended for students at the universities, and candidates for orders; and it will be found eminently useful to these classes. It reduces to the compass of a good octavo volume the bulky history of Bishop Burnet, preserving, however, much of the original style, and avoiding unnecessary diffuseness. It is so well put together that we can promise the reader not only profit but considerable interest from its perusal. The notes occasionally added by the Editor, are invariably good and useful; and his additions are not only introduced with judgment, but written with care, and on excellent principles. Such a book as the present fills a lacuna in our literature; for it was impossible to point out any book which, within a reasonable compass, gave a good and authentic account of the Reformation in England; and in these days of misrepresentation



and controversy, such a work as the present was very much wanted. We have to express our particular sense of the practical value of Professor Corrie's labours, in this instance, and to recommend the work to general notice. We can do so with entire satisfaction.

**I.—*Ecclesiastical and Civil History philosophically considered, with reference to the reunion of Christians. The first Three Books.* By GEORGE TOWNSEND, D.D., Canon of Durham, &c. London: Rivingtons.**

To do justice to the importance of Dr. Townsend's work, would demand much more space and time than we can, in this place, afford to it. The work, which already extends to two bulky and densely printed volumes, is, as may be gathered from the title, chiefly occupied in developing the author's views of Ecclesiastical history. His object is to point out the faults and failings of the various systems of Christianity, as read by the light of history, with the hope and expectation that the providence of God is gradually working the destruction of evil, and the production of final unity and holiness in the latter days. Such is the view of Dr. Townsend, in which we must discern the workings of a pious and a hopeful mind, eliciting comfort from all the antagonisms of evil by which the Gospel is beset. In point of fact, the volumes before us are an Ecclesiastical history, from the earliest period up to the death of Wycliffe, written on Dr. Townsend's view. They exhibit, certainly, considerable research and labour; and, but for the great variety of sentiments on all conceivable subjects connected with Theology which they contain, and many of which, we confess, startle us by their boldness, we should have no hesitation in recommending the work to students of Ecclesiastical history. It would be difficult to give an idea of Dr. Townsend's principles. He is a strong opponent of puritanism and dissent in all shapes, believing episcopacy to be essential to the Church. He, nevertheless, seems to deny every thing like authority in the Church, giving the fullest possible scope to private judgment. He is a very strong and decided opponent of Rome and its errors. This will furnish some faint notion of his general views; but in their details are many points which demand a much fuller examination, and more attention than we can, at this moment, give to them. We hope, on some future occasion, to revert to this subject.

**II.—*Posthumous Works of the Rev. THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Vol. I.* London: Hamilton and Adams.**

THE volume before us is the first of the edition of Dr. Chalmers'

~~Dr. Chalmers~~ works now in course of publication. It comprises an ~~introduction~~ consisting of Meditations written on Sundays by Dr. Chalmers during the latter years of his life, exhibiting his impressions of his own religious state, and giving free expression to his personal feelings. These will be read with interest and respect. The rest of the volume comprises a series of short remarks, partly critical, partly practical and devotional, which were written down each day on the perusal of the passages of Scripture to which they relate. We cannot, perhaps, better explain the nature and character of these annotations than by one or two extracts:—

"Numbers vii. 1—3. We might easily imagine the impression which the completion of the tabernacle and its setting up would have on the children of Israel. In particular, it opened the hearts of the princes, whose offerings were voluntary, yet equal; and a feeling of the suitableness of this, in which all must have acquiesced. There must have been concert and arrangement amongst them,—the partnership, as it were, of a joint and agreed-to movement. They two and two gave a wagon for each pair, and an ox a piece,—a necessary appurtenance to the tabernacle. . . .

"4, 5. And God acknowledges these free-will offerings; and condescends to give especial charge respecting them. This is a Divine testimony in favour of voluntarism, though not as an exclusive principle. He directs Moses to take the wagons and oxen, which had been brought before the tabernacle, and put them to its service. It is altogether worthy of remark, both in regard to this, and all the other offerings, that there was no such ordination respecting them, as the other things whereof Moses had a pattern shown to him on the Mount. This might be brought to bear with decisive effect on the objections of those who would refuse all that had no express Scripture for it, respecting the details of Church service and Church accommodation. There is a great deal left to human regulation—appendages of undoubted convenience, and which it were as absurd to resist on this ground, as to protest against the ringing of the people to Divine service, because there is no Scripture for a Church-bell."—p. 260, 261.

This will give a fair specimen of the general style and character of the commentary. It is familiar, and easy, but abounding in thought and in devotional feeling. It is much to be lamented, that such a man as Dr. Chalmers should have remained separated from the communion of the Church.

XIII.—*Sermons and Essays on the Apostolical Age.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M.A., &c. Oxford: Parker.

THE author of these sermons is the well-known author of the *Life of Dr. Arnold*, and is amongst the most ardent admirers of that good, though mistaken man. We therefore opened the

volume, we must confess, with certain misgivings as to the character and complexion of the doctrines we should find put forth. On the whole, while we cannot profess entire agreement with the views of the author, we have been gratified by the freedom from party spirit which characterizes his pages; and by the absence of any such dangerous and absurd statements as those which Dr. Arnold advanced in reference to the comprehension of all sects within the Church. Mr. Stanley is an eloquent and pleasing writer; and his sermons abound with illustrations, which prove his possession of extensive and varied attainments. There is much of fancifulness in his theory of the characters of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John, as typifying and representing various states of the Church at different epochs. We do not see any harm in the view, as treated by Mr. Stanley; but we do not feel that it is more than an ingenious and fanciful theory, which is made a basis for such practical lessons as the author wishes to inculcate, and which are undoubtedly good in themselves; but we regret to see in his preface an identification of his views with those of Dr. Arnold, in a way which seems to savour somewhat too much of following the guidance of a human leader, and which, moreover, suggests doubts of the real principles of those who thus openly proclaim their adhesion. We see, also, in an *Essay on the Apostolical Office*, some language which barely escapes the denial of the truth stated in the Preface to the Ordination Service, with reference to the Apostolical origin of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. We should, however, be heartily glad, if the disciples of Dr. Arnold would never put forth their views in any more dangerous form than as they appear in Mr. Stanley's pages.

- XIV.—1. *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford.* By CHARLES A. OGILVIE, D.D., &c. London: J. W. Parker.
2. *Sermons preached in the Chapel of Harrow School.* By CHARLES JOHN VAUGHAN, D.D., Head Master, &c. London: Murray.
3. *Sermons preached in the Chapel of Rossall College, Fleetwood.* By JOHN WOOLLEY, D.C.L., Head Master, &c. London: Rivingtons.

WE have grouped these volumes of sermons together, as they are addressed to young persons at schools and at the universities. Dr. Ogilvie's sermons are perfectly sound, plain, orthodox discourses. With little attempt at ornament or eloquence, they simply and sternly point out to the student the path of duty amidst the various temptations by which he is surrounded. Dr. Ogilvie is vigorous in his denunciation of Romanizing tendencies

and in his warnings against them. The publication is intended as a specimen of the mode of teaching, and the principles of the author, and we think that it is perfectly distinct and unequivocal in its character. What we want perhaps, occasionally, is somewhat more of a mingling of indulgence and gentleness in his words of reproof.

Dr. Vaughan's discourses, which were addressed to his pupils at Harrow school, are very useful and practical. Their simplicity is their chief recommendation. We presume that the publication of this volume is designed to show the nature of the religious instruction at Harrow. In this point of view it is of course interesting to parents whose children may be sent there. The same remarks nearly may be made on Dr. Woolley's sermons. They are very well adapted to their purpose; to the general reader they present not much that is calculated to attract his especial attention. There is an obvious propriety, however, in the publication of discourses under such circumstances, which would not exist otherwise.

xv.—1. *Parochial Sermons, preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Dover.* By the Rev. JOHN PUCKLE, M.A., &c. London: Rivingtons.

2. *A Series of Discourses on Practical and Doctrinal Subjects.* By the Rev. W. Dow, A.M. Edinburgh: Grant and Son.

3. *Sermons, Practical and Expository, preached at Holy Rhood Church, Southampton.* By the Rev. FREDERICK RUSSELL, M.A. London: Hatchards.

THE volume which we have placed first on our list is one which merits attention. We have been very highly gratified by all that we have seen of it. Mr. Puckle is a thorough Churchman in his views, remote from all extremes in doctrine; but still maintaining with firmness, and in a most conciliatory way, the highest principles. His sermons are addressed to a congregation which is composed of educated persons; but they are composed in a style which is perfectly intelligible, and *unaffected*—a great matter in these days. They are rich in Scripture proof, and illustration well selected. Altogether we have been particularly struck by this series of sermons, and we recommend them without hesitation to our readers.

2. Of what denomination of Christians the Rev. W. Dow may be, he does not inform us in his title-page; nor can we find out in examining his volume. The discourses do not seem to have been preached, and are of very great length. Mr. Dow is of opinion that every one who has been baptized remains a member of the Christian Church until excommunicated by lawful autho-

rity; but he professes himself totally unable to determine what lawful authority there now exists for any such purpose. He is one of those persons who imagine that *all*, or rather *no*, churches are branches of the Church of Christ; and he supposes that Revelation has only been made gradually from age to age. In short he puts forth the doctrine of development in such a way as no German Rationalist could dispute. These matters made us curious to ascertain to what communion this writer belongs, but we really cannot discover from his work whether he is a Presbyterian or not.

3. The third volume on our list seems to present no features calling for particular remark. The sermons are good and unexceptionable as far as we can see. They are practical and healthy in tone; but they do not rise above the average run of sermons in point of ability.

xvi.—*Religion and Poetry, being Selections Spiritual and Moral, from the Poetical Works of the Rev. R. MONTGOMERY, with an Introductory Essay by ARCHER GURNEY.* London: Nisbet, 1847.

MR. MONTGOMERY'S career has certainly been a most singular one. With no advantages but those of youth and innocence, a bold heart and a fluent tongue—he appeared before the public some eighteen or twenty years ago as a candidate for that most difficult of all prizes—poetical renown. He was received by the vast majority of acknowledged critics much in the same way as a young frog is welcomed by a crowd of mischievous boys who keep continually pelting him with stones every time he puts his head above water. But, unlike the hero of Mrs. Leo Hunter's inimitably touching ode—he did not expire; but, to continue the simile, each shower of stones seemed to give him new spirit. Each time that he dipped his head under water he appeared, like Antæus, to gain fresh strength from his parent element—each time that he rose above the waves a louder and a bolder sound was heard, till at length the “loud halloo and brutal cries” of his pursuers have been pretty nearly drowned by the vociferous cheers of his friends.

And what makes this the more remarkable are the following considerations—that Mr. Montgomery's poetry, whatever be its merits, has very great faults; that Mr. Montgomery himself has some unfortunate foibles; and that his poems appeal to no base or bitter passion of man's nature, gratify none of his evil desires, and flatter none of his ill-regulated fancies; and, again, though eminently a Christian poet and warmly attached to the

English Church, he is not the poet of any party either religious or political.

Taking all these things into consideration, it must, we say, be clear that this author possesses some high and intrinsic excellencies. The volume before us is intended to display these; one friend having carefully selected the finest passages of his works, and another having written a prefatory essay on his writings and genius. We own to being much and pleasingly surprised to perceive many and great beauties; sometimes, indeed, accompanied by the faults which so frequently disfigure this author's writings—at other times entirely free from them.

Take the following description of London by midnight; it is certainly very powerful and very impressive:—

“ The fret and fever of the day are o'er,  
And London slumbers, but with murmurs faint,  
Like ocean, when she folds her waves to sleep;  
'Tis the pure hour for poetry and thought;  
When passions sink, and man surveys the heavens,  
And feels himself immortal.——

“ O'er all a sad sublimity is spread,—  
The garniture of night; amid the air,  
Darkly and drear yon airy steeples rise,  
Like shadows of the past; the houses lie  
In dismal clusters, moveless as in sleep;  
And, towering far above the rest, yon dome<sup>1</sup>  
Appears, as if self-balanced in the gloom,—  
A spectre cowering o'er the dusky piles.

“ But see! I stand on ground whose glorious name  
Might turn a coward brave; on thy huge bridge,  
Triumphant Waterloo! Above, how calm!  
There moon and star commingling radiance shed,  
And bathe the skies in beauty. Smooth and pale  
The pearly bosom'd clouds recline, enlink'd  
Like wave festoons upon the glossy deep.  
Below, the Thames outspread, serene and dim;  
And, as I gaze, a cooling breath ascends,  
And melts upon my brow; like the worn heart  
When stormy cares have slept, the river seems  
Peaceful and still, save when the wind-sighs stir  
The waveless slumbers of its breast; like dreams  
That quiver on the marble face of sleep.

“ Along each side the darkling mansions frown  
Funereal in their gloom. Afar, and faint,  
The bridge lamps glimmer o'er the tranquil stream,  
As if enchain'd upon the air; beneath

<sup>1</sup> St. Paul's.



Are thrown out quivering columns of red light ;  
And, here and there, a tower and shadowy spire  
Are imaged on the water ; sad and shrunk,  
Like flower-leaves wither'd by the summer blaze.

“ Yonder, in dim magnificence, behold  
The many-window'd pile<sup>2</sup> ; apart and stern,  
In lowering grandeur, like a lofty mind,  
Unmingling with the baser crowd. One half  
Is clothed with moonlight's pallid veil ;  
Beneath, a darkness dwells, whence portals yawn  
In cavern-gloom upon the drowsy tide,  
Like tombs unbarr'd.

“ But, hark, from yonder dome  
The day is toll'd into eternity !  
How hollow, dread, and dismal, is the peal,  
Now rolling up its vast account to heaven !  
Awhile it undulates, then dies away  
In mutter'd echoes, like the ebbing groans  
Of drowning men ; and see, the toiling moon  
Is in a fane of clouds, and I am lone,  
Unseen, but by the sleepless One : O God !  
I FEEL thine eye upon me ; I shrink  
Awe-smote beneath its gaze, like melting snow  
Beneath thy sun !—

“ And shall this City queen,—this peerless mass  
Of pillar'd homes, and grey-worn towers sublime,  
Be blotted from the world, and forests wave  
Where once the second Rome was seen ? Oh ! say,  
Will rank grass grow on England's royal streets,  
And wild beasts howl, where Commerce stalk'd supreme ?  
Alas, let mem'ry dart her wizard glance  
Down vanish'd Time, till summon'd Ages rise  
With ruin'd empires on their wings ! Thought weeps  
With patriot truth to own a funeral day,  
Heart of the universe ! shall visit thee,  
When round thy wreck some lonely man shall roam,  
And, sighing, say, ‘ 'Twas here vast London stood ! ’ ”

—pp. 248—250.

Here there is nothing strained, nothing unnatural, no big words, nor overgrown ideas ; but all is simple, truthful, and sublime. There are many passages of equal merit ; nor is the beauty discernible in them all of one kind ; the dark and the bright scenes of our existence, the shadows and realities of our being, are all treated with a master hand.

<sup>2</sup> Somerset House.

As an example of the gentler beauties of our author, take the following exquisite little piece :—

**“THE INFANT IN PRAYER.**

“ ‘The smile of childhood, on the cheek of age.’

“ A child beside a mother kneels,  
With lips of holy love,  
And fain would lisp the vow it feels,  
To Him enthron’d above.

“ That cherub gaze, that stainless brow,  
So exquisitely fair !  
Who would not be an infant now,  
To breathe an infant’s pray’r ?

“ No crime hath shaded its young heart,  
The eye scarce knows a tear ;  
’Tis bright enough from earth to part,  
And grace another sphere !

“ And I was once a happy thing,  
Like that which now I see,  
No May-bird, on ecstatic wing,  
More beautifully free :

“ The cloud that bask’d in noontide glow,  
The flower that danced and shone,  
All hues and sounds, above, below,  
Were joys to feast upon !

“ Let wisdom smile ; I oft forget  
The colder haunts of men,  
To hie where infant hearts are met,  
And be a child again ;

“ To look into the laughing eyes  
And see the wild thoughts play,  
While o’er each cheek a thousand dyes  
Of mirth and meaning stray.

“ O Manhood ! could thy spirit kneel  
Beside that sunny child,  
As fondly pray, and purely feel  
With soul as undefiled,

“ That moment would encircle thee  
With light and love divine ;  
Thy gaze might dwell on Deity,  
And heaven itself be thine.”

—pp. 251, 252.

The author of such pieces as these—and there are many more of equal merit—is certainly gifted with poetic powers of no ordinary calibre. Had he always written thus, criticism would

have nothing to do. If he would write less, keep his poems longer beside him, be more fond of Saxon English, more careful to adapt the rhythm of his lines to the punctuation of his sentences, and more distrustful of his own taste when it contravenes the established laws of poetical composition, he would be one of our greatest poets.

We cannot close our remarks on this volume without expressing the gratification we have derived from the masterly piece of criticism which Mr. Archer Gurney has prefixed to it. We regret that space does not permit us to enrich our pages by some of the eloquent and striking passages with which it abounds, and which are equally creditable to the understanding and the heart of the accomplished writer. His criticism is evidently perfectly honest, and unbiassed by private feelings, as he does not hesitate to point out the faults which he has observed in the writings on which he comments.

XVII.—*Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, not forbidden by the Law of Nature, &c.* By the REV. J. F. DENHAM, M.A., &c. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

WE agree with the author of this pamphlet, in regarding the question on which he writes, as an "interesting one;" it is, we think, of considerably more importance than Mr. Denham is himself aware of. We trust, indeed, that various persons who have taken a part in attempting to repeal the existing law on the subject of marriage, would not have done so, if they had been aware of the consequences which are likely to follow in the train of any such attempt.

We are not about to enter into any discussion on the canons and laws of the Church, either in the early ages, or as now established in England. No one, we believe, denies that they speak pretty plainly against the practice of marrying a wife's sister; and the only way of meeting them is, to throw them overboard. They are, however, the canons of the Church; and we trust that as such, no legislative enactments will interfere with them, so as to authorize the clergy to perform marriages which are forbidden by them. We trust that no such interference with the morality of the Church is sought for; if it be, we trust that the Church will be able effectually to resist it.

Nor are we here about to enter on any critical examination of Scripture. We will admit that marriage with a wife's sister is not expressly prohibited in Leviticus, but marriage with a husband's brother, which is exactly the same degree of affinity, is *expressly forbidden*. Undoubtedly, a brother was required in one particular case to marry his brother's wife, which is an affinity in the same degree; but all that can be inferred from this, ex-

by Mr. Denham, is, that the "Law of Nature" does not prohibit such marriages. Supposing, for a moment, that this is true, still it does not follow that they may be contracted, when God expressly or virtually forbids them.

But we here meet the advocates of a change in the law on broader grounds. They ground their claim on the impropriety of continuing any restrictions on marriage except those imposed by the "Law of Nature." Now, will these persons tell us, what there is in the "Law of Nature" to prevent *polygamy*? Are they prepared to advocate the abolition of the laws against bigamy? Is not polygamy allowed in the Old Testament? And, therefore, ought they not in consistency to argue for its revival? And again, if the "Law of Nature" only is to be our guide, then we affirm that there will be abundant arguments found to permit marriages between brothers and sisters, and uncles and nieces. There is, positively, no certainty that the "Law of Nature" prohibits such marriages. All the Romish Casuists maintain that they are degrees which are within the papal dispensations, and that they are not prevented by any law of nature. In short, with the exception of marriages between parents and children, there is no other relation which may not become a subject of cavil and disputation on these grounds, if this claim be admitted. Whatever may be the decisions of the legislature on this subject, the obloquy attaching to incestuous marriages will, we trust, never be removed; for it will not be, of course, attempted to make the Church do what is, in her opinion, wrong. If marriages of this kind are to be contracted, it must be before civil officers, or before ministers of some dissenting denomination. We trust, however, that the legislature will maturely weigh the encouragement which any interference with the ancient established law of England on this matter would give to further interference with the general law of marriage. If this attempt succeeds, what is there to prevent a number of persons from marrying their uncles or their aunts, and then calling for legislative interference to change the law? The advocates of this measure will not be withheld by the laws on this subject contained in the Bible: they only allow them in subordination to what they are pleased to call the "Law of Nature." Mr. Denham thus answers the question, "Are these Levitical laws still binding on Christians?"—

"We reply in the affirmative, in regard to all that portion of them which is founded on *the Law of Nature*, for the point we maintain is, that *the Law of Nature*, strictly speaking, is *the marriage-law of mankind*."—p. 28.

Now, what says Liguori on this point? "*Gradus lineæ rectæ, hile est, omnes jure naturæ esse prohibitos. Sed satis pre-*

*babile est omnes esse vetitos jure ecclesiastico, excepto primo gradu in linea recta.*”—(Liguori Theol. Mor. Lib. v. Tract. vi. 1029.) This shows pretty plainly what the “Law of Nature” allows; and to go another step in advance: there is a great question whether the “Law of Nature” requires “marriage” at all. There have been many nations in which the men and women lived in a state of promiscuous concubinage. Such, if we are to believe Cæsar, was the custom of the ancient Britons. It is, of course, certain, that such habits are opposed to the laws of God; but whether they are opposed to the “Law of Nature,” as it is called, is another matter. We would recommend Mr. Denham, and other advocates of alterations in our marriage-laws, to look somewhat beyond the mere case of persons desirous of marrying their wives’ sisters. They may depend upon it, that the question involves most momentous consequences to morality and religion.

XVIII.—1. *Apostacy. A Sermon, &c. By the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A.* London: Cleaver.

2. *A Statement of Facts. By ALEXANDER CHIROL, B.A.* London: Burns.

3. *Conversion. A Letter to Mr. A. Chirol. By the Right Rev. N. WISEMAN, D.D.* London: Burns.

4. *An Answer to Dr. Wiseman’s Letter. By a BACHELOR OF DIVINITY.* London: Rivingtons.

WE have risen from the perusal of the series of publications which have taken place on occasion of Mr. Chirol’s secession from the Church of England, certainly not without regret, but with a conviction of the sincerity of the various parties concerned. In Mr. Bennett’s publications there is at times, certainly, a severity of tone, which we are sorry to see; but we think that great allowance must be made for the peculiarly trying circumstances in which he was placed; and his conduct throughout evinces, in our opinion, his indulgence for the infirmities of unsettled minds, while it proves his own steadfastness and determination in guarding his flock against the attempts of Romanists. We can conceive that some of the expressions employed in Mr. Bennett’s *Notices* might have been advantageously omitted or modified; but looking at the whole case, we cannot but think that he has acted with kindness, firmness, and zeal.

The ground which Mr. Bennett takes in dwelling on the fact, that a clergyman who forsakes the Church for a schism is *more guilty* than a layman, inasmuch as he breaks *special vows and engagements*, is perfectly valid in our opinion. Of course we only

speaking of the *general* principle which he maintains. Dr. Wiseman himself would hold that a monk who forsook the Romish communion to enter that of the English Church, and who also contracted marriage, would not only be guilty of schism, but of breach of vows. He would be *more guilty* than a layman who merely joined the Church. On the same principle it is, we think, undeniable, *in our view of the case*, that a clergyman forsaking the Church for the Romish communion is more guilty than a layman, because he adds the breach of vows to schism and profession of error.

Of Dr. Wiseman's Letter we shall only say, that it appears to us intemperate in tone; and that it thus forms a strong contrast to the general mildness of his effusions. Dr. W. is very angry with Mr. Bennett, which, we think, he could hardly be, if he was really convinced, that "the efforts which men devoted like Mr. Bennett to *Anglicanism*, are making to raise its character and position, lead many to the [Romish] Church." We apprehend, that the exacerbation of the Rev. Doctor's feelings must arise from the fact, that "the leaders of this party, or *apostates* in the Anglican Establishment," as he contemptuously designates certain persons, "take on themselves the guidance of the consciences of others . . . staking their own salvation TO KEEP THEM BACK FROM THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, with a boldness that savours of desperation, and an assurance that claims infallibility." Here is the sore point. We can make every charitable allowance for Dr. Wiseman's lack of temper. We can feel for the severely tantalizing process to which he is continually subjected; but we regret that it is not in our power to wish that his cravings may be relieved.

As to the chief contents of Dr. Wiseman's Letter, they are merely a repetition of the common-place arguments against the notion of there being any divisions in the Church; in reply to which we refer to what has been elsewhere said on the "*Romish Theory of Unity*;" and they are interlarded with remarks on the present divided state of the Church in England. In reference to this we suggest a study of the history of the Church of Rome from 1650 to 1750. The "*Bachelor of Divinity*" has answered Dr. Wiseman very well.

---

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The press of important matter this quarter, must plead our excuse for deferring the notice of several publications which have reached us.



## Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

FRANCE.—*Adhesion of the French Episcopate to the Liberalism of Pius IX. Attempted revival of the tribute of Peter-pence.*—The French bishops, whose position has long been an anomalous one in a country, all the institutions of which are based upon the principles of the revolution, are hastening to express their sympathy with the new attitude which the papacy has assumed under Pius IX., and which they cannot but be sensible will greatly strengthen their hands. Another onward step has thus been gained in consolidating the significant and threatening alliance which has for some time been growing up between the spiritual enmity which Rome bears to the Church, and the political hatred which the French nation entertains towards the people, of England. In testimony of their cordial adhesion to the policy of the new pope, the leading members of the French Episcopate have published *mandements*, ordering prayers for the success of his various measures and plans of reform; and, in addition to this, they have set on foot a subscription, which, under the modern title of “Civil List of Pius IX.,” is intended as a revival of the ancient custom of paying Peter-pence.

The *mandement* of the Archbishop of Paris, published in September last, contains the following echo of the manifesto pronounced by Father Ventura, on the occasion of O’Connell’s funeral: “The Catholic nations will become more and more convinced, that, in order to enjoy political freedom steadily and without storms, they must obtain it from the fountain from which it flowed in the first instance for the deliverance of the Roman empire, and of the barbarian nations, &c.”

Far more important, however, than the *Mandement* of the Archbishop of Paris, is that of the Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons, the intrepid censurer of the book of M. Dupin, who, having raised his influential voice not in defence, but in high eulogy, of the new papal policy, follows up his words of commendation with a still more substantial proof of sympathy and devotion, by an appeal to his diocese for a collection to be made in aid of the pope’s finances. The exordium of his *mandement*, which bears the date of October 12th, is characteristic of the man who has grown hoary in controversy against the free-thinkers of France:—“For some years past, the press, speaking with its thousand voices, and in all the idioms, repeats in our ears, that the Catholic religion has descended into the tomb with its institutions, its influence, its traditions; that it is wandering about amongst us, like a plaintive shadow mourning over its bygone power and its irretrievably eclipsed greatness. Some writers, who allow that it has a faint glimmering of life left, surround its death-bed, announcing in a tone of authority that its agony has commenced, and its last hour is come. They once more salute the departing queen, and bestow a hypocritical condolence upon her last moments. They are sages, who give utterance to these prophetic words; *savants* bearing the sceptre of history and poesy, whose eloquent pen draws this sombre picture; they are indefatigable scrutinizers of the secrets of nature, who, in a tone of compassion, wish that the earth may press lightly upon her who has preserved the deposit of all the sciences; in a word, they are great minds, who think that

steam, rather than righteousness, exalt the nations; and that the Catholic Church, unable to do any more for them, ought to enter into her rest, and to sleep her sleep.

"While these *savants* and sages are delivering their oracles, and while their lugubrious chants celebrate the funeral rites of religion, a pontiff of that religion rises from his ancient seat, pronounces a few words, traces rapidly a few lines; and the listless world shakes off its torpor, and with its learned men, its sages, its prophets, and its grandees, bows before the representative of Him who is 'the way, the truth, and the life.'

"The thinkers and the philosophers of the age were passing by the papacy, shaking their heads, and saying to it as the Jews said to Jesus on the cross: 'If thou art of God, save thyself!' Thinking they had sealed up the sepulchre of Catholicism, they were congratulating themselves on being able quietly to pursue the road of progress, without finding any longer in their way that Church whose morality was to them so troublesome, and whose voice had so often run counter to their passions. And lo! the head of that Church still ventures to speak, to write, to command, in fact to live, and to breathe life into that which had no life left, to gather what was scattered, and to attempt what no other power could have attempted. The revilers of the papacy are condemned to praise the acts of a pope; their proud pen is reduced to become the apologist of the Bishop of Rome, of the head of the Catholic Church, of the supreme pontificate."

After inviting the people of his diocese to offer up prayers for the pontiff, whom "Providence has placed on the throne, in order to show to the nations and the kings, what the sincere alliance of religion and liberty can do for the nations," Mgr. de Bonald passes on to the subject of the collection. "But," he continues, "will Catholic France have nothing else to offer to its pastor than the aid of its prayers? In the middle ages, Europe would have risen in arms, to offer to the head of the Church its blood and its sword, for the defence of his menaced rights, and for his support in the conflict in which he has engaged against every abuse. Now-a-days a more peaceable crusade might be undertaken by the faithful on behalf of their spiritual chief. The mite offered by Christians which dissipates the darkness of ignorance to the very ends of the world, and plants the civilizing cross upon the most unknown rock, that mite which has so great a power in establishing the kingdom of Jesus Christ, might it not, more efficiently than battalions of brave soldiers, give to the immortal Pius IX. a support which would cause no tears to flow, which would drag no son away from his mother, nor carry the horrors of war into the midst of peaceable populations? It is not the clergy that should receive these offerings in order to transmit them to the representative among us, of the successor of St. Peter; malignity might yet cast a suspicion upon our disinterestedness. But always rightly directed by their zeal and their charity, the Catholics might be able to devise another mode of collection. Their pontiffs and their priests would gladly deposit their gifts in the hands chosen for receiving them. We leave this thought

a faithful. God will render it fruitful, if it may turn to His and to the welfare of a friendly nation."

The suggestion of the cardinal archbishop was taken up with great effect by the *Ami de la Religion*, which on the 28rd of October contains a long article, headed "Appeal to all Christians; Civil List of X.," in which the whole "Catholic world," but especially the French and the "French Catholic ladies," *par excellence*, are called upon to lend a helping hand in carrying out the idea first thrown out by the archbishop of Lyons. In several of the dioceses committees for the abolition of the "Papal Civil List," or "Peter Pence," as it is called, have been organised, and collections have already been paid to the hands of the nuncio. It is intended not to confine this scheme of papal taxation to France or to the present moment, but to extend it to other countries where there is a Roman Catholic population, and to make it a permanent papal "rent."

*Society of Oceania; Arche d'Alliance.*—Among the various schemes now set on foot for the double purpose of advancing popery and increasing the political power of France, the formation of a society, the name of the "Society of Oceania," ought not to be suffered to pass unnoticed. The society in question, whose official organ is a weekly publication, entitled, *L'Arche d'Alliance*, announces itself as a general, commercial society for the service of the Catholic mission, for the establishment of Christian colonies, and the development of European commerce in transatlantic countries." It was founded some years ago by a young Havre merchant, M. Marziou, who is its president. It is under the special patronage of Pius IX., who has placed his name among the subscribers, and has addressed to it a letter of encouragement and benediction. The society has in its service several vessels and a brig; the names of the vessels are, the "*Arche d'Alliance*," the "Packet-boat of the Southern Seas," the "Anonymous," the "Morning Star," and the "*Stella Maris*." The operations of the society are to embrace, not only the islands of the Pacific, but the coasts of South America, Australia, and Asia, where branch establishments are actually set up, or in contemplation. The society combines the character of a religious association with that of a joint stock company; it receives subscriptions, and sells shares bearing interest; it carries on imports and exports of monks and nuns as missionaries. It appears, in fact, an attempt to revive the system of combining commercial and missionary operations, so long carried on with astonishing success by the Jesuits, and brought to a termination by the failure of Father Lavalette in China. In addition to the branch establishments in the countries over which its operations are to extend, it is proposed to form branch associations of shareholders and subscribers in different countries. "The numerous manifestations of sympathy," says the first number of the *Arche d'Alliance*, "which reach us daily from foreign parts, give us reason to hope, that ere long new national branch associations will be formed in Belgium, in the United States, in Brazil, and even in India, where a committee has already been formed." There are committees in all the principal towns of France, and an Italian branch

association has been formed, with three committees at Rome, at Genoa, and at Turin. An extensive report, dated Sydney, March 26th, from Lieutenant *Marceau*, the commander of the vessel *L'Arche d'Alliance*, had been received at Paris, of which the journal of the same name says, that it "contains the most satisfactory intelligence touching the commercial success of the society, and the important services which it has already rendered to the missions. If it were possible," continues the *Arche d'Alliance*, "without compromising the interests of the society, to publish the documents which have reached us, we have no doubt that all our friends would take immediate steps to procure additional co-operation for our undertaking." Considering that the pope has officially announced himself as the patron of the society, and that its vessels are commanded by naval officers of the papal maritime powers, the scheme, though as yet in its infancy, is sufficiently important to call forth the vigilance of those whom, in a religious, political, or commercial point of view, it may concern.

GERMANY.—*Further Development of Rationalism.*—The Prussian government, having, by the Edict of Toleration published in March last<sup>1</sup>, afforded to the malcontents and unbelievers of the "Evangelic Church" an opportunity of constituting separate religious communities, is now taking decided steps for ejecting the most unsound and refractory of the rationalistic ministers, and exacting within the pale of the established Protestant communion something like submission, not, indeed, to any positive standards of faith,—which would be wholly impossible,—but to the constituted authorities, on whom, in the present lax and unsettled state of opinion, both in the public generally, and in a large proportion of the clerical body, devolves the difficult task of pronouncing what limits of rationalistic licence shall not be exceeded.

At Königsberg, where Dr. Rupp<sup>2</sup>, after his deposition, collected around him a mixed multitude of unbelievers, the civil authorities insisted upon compliance with the police regulations affecting those who dissented from the established communion. The Ruppists made a show of resistance at first, but thought better of it afterwards; and, relinquishing the untenable position that they had not ceased to be members of the Evangelic Church, consented to be considered and dealt with as a separate body, under the name of the "Free Evangelic Church," which they assumed in contradistinction to the "Consistorial" or "National Evangelic Church." Although, according to the theory of Dr. Rupp, the distinction between clergy and laity is a mere invention of man,—the only effect of ordination being, to "lift up the parties ordained above their station and above the people,"—he himself continues to officiate, together with two "candidates of theology" who have joined his sect, under the name of "servants of the congregation." With this the authorities do not interfere, further than to enforce certain regulations affecting public assemblies for purposes of worship; and to erase from the list of "candidates of theology," the names of those can-

<sup>1</sup> See English Review, vol. vii. pp. 491—493.

<sup>2</sup> See English Review, vol. vii. pp. 230, 231.

ates who have mixed themselves up with the proceedings of the free Evangelic Church."

How truly the sect which assumes that name is "free" from every both of doctrine and of discipline, our readers may gather from the following brief, but significant data. On Easter-day, Dr. Rupp expounded the text, "Now is Christ risen from the dead," as an allegory showing the events of the present time, when, he said, "the long-sealed tomb of humanity was being opened, and the *palladia* of liberty, peace, and truth were rising from it." On the occasion of his introducing the two "candidates," his future "fellow-servants of the congregation," he expounded 1 Thess. ii. 13, to the effect, that the apostle had fallen into a strange mistake by distinguishing between "the word of God" and "the word of men," a distinction "wholly unknown to Jesus of Nazareth." There was, in fact, he contended, no other word of God," but that which the spirit of man produced from its own power; and, having characterized the clergy of the "consistorial church" as a "memorial of the melancholy errors of by-gone times," drew a parallel between the Reformation of the sixteenth, and that of the nineteenth century. As the watchword of the former had been, "Down with the pope, and the priests, and the monks, and the nuns; let us have nothing but the word of God;" so the watchword of the religious emancipation of the nineteenth century was, "Down with priests and clergy; let us have nothing but the word of God, as it is exhibited in the word of men." While thus every doctrinal barrier is brought down, all the ordinances of the Church are dealt with in the same lax and licentious spirit. Even with regard to marriage, though it continues to be solemnized by him, Dr. Rupp declares, that it is valid before God, irrespectively of all human sanction or recognition, if it be sanctified by purity of heart and mutual faithfulness. Baptism is administered by any body and every body in the congregation, and with any form of words which the party officiating may, *pro re nata*, choose to adopt. At one time the words are: "I baptize thee in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, who has taught us to invoke God in spirit and in truth;" at another time, "I baptize thee in the name of thy God, that thy soul may remain as pure as the water with which I sprinkle thy head; I baptize thee in the name of thy Redeemer, and I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Ghost;"—at another time, again, "I baptize thee according to the ancient apostolic baptism, that Jesus is the Christ, the Saviour of the human race; I sprinkle thy head with water, in token that thy soul may remain pure as the fountain that springs from the rocks. As the waters ascend up towards heaven, and return upon the earth, so mayest thou be always mindful of thy heavenly country." Such and such like sentimental trash, extemporized on the occasion, substituted for the one only form which, although ordained by Christ himself, is the only one objected to, and invariably avoided by these pretenders to His holy name. A species of confirmation is administered by Dr. Rupp, on Whitsunday, but professedly with no other intention than that of receiving into the covenant of Christianity young persons who will afterwards have to decide for themselves what deno-

mination they shall choose to join. The Holy Communion is, like the other sacrament, superseded; any of the members who feel so inclined, partake together of bread and wine, singing psalms, and reading some portions of Scripture. A kind of declaration has been printed, and privately circulated, setting forth the "aim and order of life" of the "Free Evangelic Church," with a proviso, that nothing therein contained is to be considered as having force of "law," but merely as the expression of the "counsel and wish of the majority." From this document we learn, that any body who wishes to join the congregation is admitted; if he likes to assign a reason for his wish, "the congregation will be pleased;" and if not, it will be contented. There are assemblies every Sunday, holyday, and Friday, when there is singing and preaching; when baptisms and lovefeasts usually take place; when suggestions are made for new arrangements, the most recent publications circulated among the members are discussed, and orations delivered on the more important interests of humanity. The administration of the affairs of the congregation is vested in a body of elders, chosen by the members at large, every person above twenty, male or female, being entitled to a vote. The age of instruction is divided into three periods, from seven to twelve, from twelve to sixteen, and from sixteen to twenty years old; both sexes are to be instructed together; and above the age of twenty, the cultivation of the mind of the congregation is provided for by the circulation of books in different departments of literature. That a body so constituted cannot possibly be recognized as a Christian communion, is evident; and, accordingly, the consistory of the province issued on the fourth of August last, a Circular to the Clergy of the Evangelic Church, explaining to them its vague and anomalous character, and directing them not to acknowledge the so-called baptism ministered by these sectarians (unless it were satisfactorily proved that the words of institution had been adhered to, in which case the matter is to be submitted to the superior authority); but to baptize *de novo*, without taking any account of the spurious ceremony in question; and to repel from the Holy Communion all persons connected with the "free Evangelic Church," and to restore them only on repentance, and total renunciation of their connexion with that body.

Similar movements have been made at Halle, under the auspices of the notorious G. A. Wislicenus<sup>3</sup>; at Halberstadt, under those of another Wislicenus, brother of the former, who resigned his office as pastor at Bedra; and at Nordhausen, under the auspices of one Baltzer, a coadjutor of Wislicenus, who was formerly preacher at the church of St. Moritz at Naumburg, but was deposed from his office on account of his heterodoxy and irregularities. At Halle the separatists were called upon to furnish a declaration of their principles, in order that their position might be defined under the provisions of the edict of toleration. In their reply, they stated that they were "at variance with the doctrine, the customs, and institutions of the Church; and that, having given up all hopes of substantial reform in the Church,

<sup>3</sup> See *English Review*, vol. iii. pp. 508—512, and vol. vii. pp. 231, 232.



they had combined together for the furtherance of their moral and intellectual life." They disavowed all intention of laying claim to ecclesiastical rights, or to recognition as a religious body. They wished to be considered simply as a private association, the members of which were free to remain within the pale of the Evangelic Church, or to separate from it, as they might feel disposed; and must, therefore, be dealt with by the state according to the position which they individually assumed. Agreeably to this view, Wislicenus does not call his party a "Free Church," but only a "Free Congregation;" of which he himself says, in the August number of his journal, "*Kirchliche Reform* (Church Reform):"—"The Free Congregation rests upon the entire historical existence of the nations in times past; it feeds upon all the means of culture which the world offers to it in the past or present, no matter where or in whose hands those intellectual materials may be found. The idea of the Free Congregation is, that it should be an universal institution for the cultivation of the popular mind, a kind of democratic academy, a sort of school of life and business, a species of popularized freemasonry, in which there are working-days and lodges, but no secrets and no obsolete forms and formularies. All tradesmen's clubs, insurances, savings-banks, mechanics' associations, polytechnic societies, Sunday-schools, bands of singers, &c., have, in fact, the same object in view as the Free Congregation; they are all working out so many special modes of applying and carrying into execution that great principle of humanity, which it is the object of the Free Congregation to enunciate in its oneness and universality, to keep it alive, and to cause it morally to fructify in the case of each individual; consequently they are all allies, sisters, nay, so to speak, spiritual daughters of the Free Congregation, even without knowing or intending it." To the intellectual phantom so described under the name of the "Free Congregation," Wislicenus does not hesitate blasphemously to apply that word of Holy Scripture, in reference to Christ: "It is," he says, "a sign spoken against every where, and set for the fall and rising again of many in our day." In the office of feeding this strange flock, Wislicenus has obtained a coadjutor in the person of a German-Catholic minister of the name of Giese, who, without renouncing his own communion, fraternizes with the "Free Congregation;" and has given proof of his qualifications as an "instructor of the foolish," by publishing a selection of texts, with hints for improving them, taken from Schiller's William Tell; (*sic* /) ex. gr. "Just heaven! when shall to this land a Saviour arise?"—"What's sent by heaven, must be borne; injustice no generous heart endures;" which latter text is applied to the recently published edict of toleration.

In the "Free Church" at Nordhausen, on the contrary, all the ministerial functions of marrying, baptizing, confirming, administering the communion, are performed, without any reference to the provisions of the edict of toleration, by Baltzer, against whom judicial proceedings have accordingly been instituted. The peculiarity of the sect in this place consists in its symbolical and vocal tendencies. Of the latter it gives evidence by the introduction, into the Sunday assemblies, of

scraps of music, fragments of oratorios, glees, original pieces of poetry and composition; in short, any thing and every thing that can be sung, excepting only the psalms and hymns of the Church, and such sentiments as would be contrary to "the principles" of the Congregation. The symbolical propensities of the Baltzerian schism are illustrated by a seal which its founder caused to be engraved, representing, in the lower half, this earthly globe, with the inscription, "Free Protestant Congregation at Nordhausen;" and over it the sun, between whose rays the legend "German Church" indicates the source from which the former is to derive its light and warmth. Another of the symbolical objects, held in high veneration by the new lights of Nordhausen, is a flagon, with the inscription, "Pour forth into the chalice the wine, the vital power! Flow forth, O holy love, into the mind of man!" Below this distich is inscribed the name of the donor, "Mrs. Frederica Louisa Charlotte Chalibæus *née* Knochenhauer;" which latter name, the lady's maiden name, conveys, we regret to say, the inelegant idea of "bone-cleaver." The use of this flagon has not been interfered with; but the seal, a very innocent plaything we should have thought, has been made the subject of a special interdict, pronounced by no less an authority than the supreme governor of the province.

More consistent than the incongruities of Dr. Rupp, more decided than the hesitations of Wislicenus, and more serious as well as more mischievous than the fooleries of Baltzer, has been the course pursued by the "chief agitator" among these ecclesiastical demagogues, Pastor Uhlich. Originally he had filled the obscure post of incumbent of Pömmelte, from which he contrived, however, to make himself sufficiently conspicuous, by his rationalistic itinerancy, to earn the name of "the Protestant apostle." The celebrity which he thus acquired procured for him a call to the church of St. Catharine at Magdeburg, in the summer of the year 1845; when it became a question with the superior ecclesiastical authority whether his nomination should be allowed. Yielding to the popular feeling, which ran very high at Magdeburg in favour of the appointment, the consistory determined to induct him, in October, 1845; but not without directing his attention in the most pointed manner to his ordination engagements, and requiring an express and solemn promise, on his part, to adhere in his teaching to the doctrine of the symbolical books, and in his ministrations to conform to the established liturgy. By virtue of that latitude of mental reservation which rationalism has in common with Jesuitism, Uhlich felt little scruple in making, and still less in breaking that promise. Various irregularities; his rationalistic missionary excursions into different parts of Germany; the evening assemblies of the "friends of light," which were held at his house for the discussion of religious questions; and the deviations from the liturgy which he permitted himself, especially in reference to the sacrament of baptism and to confirmation, called forth the interference of the authorities as early as the latter part of the year 1846.

<sup>4</sup> See English Review, vol. iii. pp. 509, 510.

At last, on the 30th of January last, he received a communication from the consistory, in which he was peremptorily called upon to declare within a fortnight, if he was willing to conform to the order of the Church or not. While Uhlich was pondering his reply, which he was in no hurry to give, the president of the consistory, Mr. Göschel, was subjected to a visitation which, according to the usual course of ecclesiastic proceedings, he could scarcely have looked for. On the evening of the 17th of February, as the clock struck six, a rush was made into his house by a body of between eighty and one hundred ladies, who forced their way into his presence, and surrounded him on all sides so as to cut off his retreat. For three quarters of an hour this deputation kept the unhappy president in durance, not vile, but fair, several of the ladies, besides the spokeswoman who formally presented their address, endeavouring to impress upon his mind how anxious the inhabitants of Magdeburg were that Pastor Uhlich should not in any way be interfered with. This formidable demonstration was followed up on the 1st of March by a remonstrance from seventy-one male members of Uhlich's congregation, fathers of families whose children had been prepared for confirmation by him, in which they stated explicitly that they themselves did not believe in all the statements of the Apostles' Creed, (the omission of which from his instructions and from the act of confirmation constituted the *gravamen* of the charge against Uhlich,) and that they would not suffer their children to be made to play the hypocrite at their confirmation; adding that to require the children to repeat that Creed as a profession of their faith was an act of spiritual despotism against which they loudly protested. The consistory hesitated, and seemed disposed to let Uhlich alone; it even permitted the holding of the evening assemblies at his house, provided they were confined to his own parishioners: and it is hard to say how long he would have been permitted to play off his rationalistic pranks with impunity, if he had been the least inclined to keep within the bounds of moderation. But his sermon on Easter-day, in which he denied the reality of Christ's death, and which produced a great sensation in Magdeburg, rendered it impossible for the authority to shut its eyes any longer. Finding himself in imminent danger, he had recourse to the expedient of addressing an immediate appeal to the king in person<sup>6</sup>. Agreeably to the instructions given by the king to the minister of worship, the latter, communicating the document itself which contained those instructions, addressed to Uhlich a letter of remonstrance, concluding with an appeal to his own conscience, to examine carefully the position in which he had placed himself towards the Church, and thereupon to judge for himself what he ought to do, and what the ecclesiastic authority could not forbear to do under existing circumstances. This was followed by a summons to appear personally before the consistory, to account for the discourse preached by him on Easter-day, the result of which was a further communication from the consistory to

<sup>6</sup> See this appeal and the king's decision in regard to it, in the *English Review*, vol. vii. pp. 493—495.

Uhlich, in which, after reminding him of the promises made at his ordination, and more recently at his institution to St. Catharine's Church, the consistory intimated, that but for the expression of the royal pleasure to afford him an opportunity of reconsidering his course, proceedings must at once have been taken. A further term of three weeks was then allowed him, within which he was called upon to give in his final declaration, in reply to the question proposed to him, whether "*he was willing to discharge his ecclesiastic functions for the future in a manner conformable to the duties of his office?*" This promise he was required to give in the sense of the remonstrance addressed to him by the consistory; and he was specially warned, that it was not intended to ensnare his conscience, but that his promise must be in accordance with his real feelings, altogether "free, faithful, and true;" the object of the consistory being to obtain a sufficient guarantee for his future good behaviour, and such an acknowledgment of past offences as might enable the consistory to overlook them. Uhlich, in his reply, repelled the charge of inconsistency or breach of promise on his part, and repudiated the jurisdiction of the consistory itself, on the plea that he was responsible to God alone for the due discharge of his ministerial office. With a forbearance rarely exhibited by a tribunal whose authority is set at nought, as that of the consistory was by Uhlich, the consistory commissioned the general superintendant, Dr. Möller, to confer further with Uhlich, with a view to bring him to a better mind. This was accordingly done; at the same time that certain questions were proposed to him to which he was to return a categorical answer within a month. The questions were, 1. Whether he was willing thenceforward faithfully and punctually to follow the regular directions of the liturgy in the performance of his official functions? 2. Whether he was willing to abstain for the future from attacking the doctrine of the Evangelic Church, as recognized both by the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, and especially from calling into question any of the articles of the Apostles' Creed? If his conscience did not permit him to answer these two questions in the affirmative, he was then asked, 3. Whether he was willing voluntarily to resign his office of pastor in the Evangelic Church, and place himself under the provisions of the edict of the 30th of March?

Reasonable as were these requirements, and temperate and even kind as was the tone of the general superintendant's admonition, they produced no effect upon Uhlich's mind. Protests and petitions were forthwith got up by the people of Magdeburg, and by the elders of his congregation, which led the consistory in its own defence to publish the proceedings which had taken place up to that date. At last he gave in his answer, which consisted of nothing but evasive and sophistical pleas, in which he went so far as to maintain that he was entitled as a rationalist to the place which he occupied in the United Evangelic Church. The result was the inevitable one of suspending Uhlich from his office, and proceeding in the way of regular information against him. This result, it appears, took Uhlich by surprise; for he entered a solemn protest against the whole proceeding, representing himself as the object of a

violent and unjust persecution ; and anticipating what the issue of the proceeding would ultimately be, he at once constituted a Free Church in Magdeburg, which soon amounted to several thousand members. The popular display made on the occasion was quite unusual ; but the authorities were determined not to concede the point, but to assert the order of the Church in opposition to popular clamour. The cause was proceeded with, and Uhlich finally deposed from the ministry upon the ground of no less than eighty heretical propositions alleged against him out of his writings. But so unblushing had his party become, that they ventured to petition the king himself for the abolition of the law which makes the use of the Liturgy compulsory. The answer of the king is firm and decided, and holds out a fair promise, that the cause of truth will be maintained against the licentiousness of the rationalistic party.

"I am greatly surprised," his majesty is reported to have said, "at your request. The faith of the Church is in a great measure contained in those things which you ask me to abolish ; and as the protector of the Church, I am determined to preserve that faith inviolate. I declare this, fully conscious that I am speaking in God's presence. Let no one imagine that thousands of signatures can produce the least effect upon my mind where truth is concerned ; for truth is not a matter of majority or minority. The faith for which your fathers have undergone the baptism of blood, was assuredly not the faith of Uhlich. I have granted liberty of conscience by an edict conformable alike to the laws of the land and to the spirit of the Church. I have called into existence a synod charged with introducing into the Church the developments of which she stands in need. Allow, therefore, those measures to take their course. Take back your petition, and reflect more maturely upon its contents."

The expulsion of Uhlich from the Evangelic Church, and the formation by him of an important body of separatists at Magdeburg, became the signal for an attempt to organize a rationalistic church on a larger scale, by the association of the different local communities. Two preliminary meetings for this purpose were held in the early part of September at Nordhausen and at Halberstadt, to which deputies were sent from Königsberg, Halle, Hamburg, Marburg, Naumburg, and from other places of lesser note. Some of the members of these "Synods" were ladies. The nature of their deliberations may be inferred from the fact, that the question whether or not they should retain the name of Christians, gave rise to the most animated discussions, and was at last left undecided. Indeed the synod appears to have been strangely determined to puzzle itself ; for the first question, "What is it that unites us ?" was about the most perplexing which so heterogeneous an assemblage could take in hand. We cannot undertake to give our readers a report, at all likely to be intelligible, of the metaphysical distinctions in which the parties endeavoured to embody their points of difference, not only from the Evangelical Church, but from each other. They agreed at last that the common ground on which they all stood, was "pure humanity, neither doctrine, nor person, nor Bible, nor symbol." In

what light they were to view their relation to the State, especially under the edict of March last, was another point on which they could not come to an agreement, any further than that they pledged themselves to seek for a remission of the expenses attendant upon separation from the Church. When the question of their constitution came to be agitated, they were unanimous in determining that each congregation should govern itself, and legislate for itself; their mutual association extending no further than the agreement to meet annually in a conference attended by deputies from the different congregations. A proposal that the German-Catholics, and the Reform party among the Jews should be invited to be present at their deliberations, was received with general favour. With regard to their form of worship, nothing of a definite kind was adopted. Singing, it was thought, at proper times, and of such compositions as are expressive of freedom, was desirable. Baptism, communion, and such like forms, were a matter of optional custom, and might be used or disused, as might seem fit to different congregations, and to different members of the same congregation.

The suggestion for obtaining the co-operation of the German Catholics was subsequently acted upon, and an attempt made in the early part of October to amalgamate the two parties. It was found, however, that there were among the German-Catholics, among the congregations at least, though scarcely among the leaders, too many positive elements of Christianity yet remaining to admit of a coalition between the different sections of separatists from the evangelic and the Romish communions respectively. All that could be arrived at, was a species of "alliance," under the name of the "United Congregation;" the terms of the compact securing to each separate congregation the right of holding as much or as little as the majority in each might see fit to hold, of the articles of the Christian faith. "They wish," to use their own expression, "to have unity of life, not unity of faith." This scheme of combination is, however, discouraged by the government; and at Neumarkt, where the two congregations, the "Free Evangelic" and the "German-Catholics" were on the point of coalescing, the continued use of a building which the latter had obtained from the authorities, was made dependent on their continued separation from the Protestant "friends of light."

What will be the end of these tendencies, contradictory in themselves, yet all converging towards the one principle of negation, of radical opposition to all the established safeguards and institutions of religion, it is impossible to tell. Many of those who are on the spot, expect that the reaction will be salutary rather than otherwise, and calculated to advance the cause of truth and order; but we cannot share this sanguine expectation, simply because those who advocate the orthodox tendency, are themselves unsound in the faith. While the arguments employed to convict an Uhlich of heterodoxy, are founded not so much upon his deviation from the testimony of Holy Writ, and his departure from the common and historically transmitted standards of Catholic truth, as upon the fact of his rationalism going beyond the



authorized limits within which Dr. Neander confines rationalistic speculation, which was one of the leading features of general superintendent Möller's remonstrance, we confess we have little hope that any good will come of a mere ecclesiastic and doctrinal conservatism. We do not expect to reap the goodly fruit of faith from the evil tree of unbelief, however closely pruned and nicely trained *secundum artem* that tree may be.

*Gustavus Adolphus Association.*—This association, whose very existence had been placed in the utmost jeopardy, as our readers will remember, by the election of Dr. Rupp as one of the representatives for Königsberg, has escaped for the present by a compromise of the most extraordinary kind. The violent resolutions for and against the re-admission of Dr. Rupp passed at the provincial assemblies, the votes of censure and of approbation bestowed upon his admission to the central assembly last year, and the steps taken in more than one quarter to form a new association on Church principles, boded nothing but trouble and disunion. In this state of affairs, the meeting of the central assembly took place at Darmstadt on the twenty-second of September. Dr. Zimmerman, who is one of the founders, and the leading man in the association, being chosen president, he contrived to limit the discussion on the knotty question touching Dr. Rupp to four speakers, two on each side; after which the formation of a committee of six, three on each side, was suggested, who with the aid of an umpire, if necessary, should draw up terms of agreement. The proposal made by this committee embraced the following points: 1. That in deciding upon the admission of a deputy, regard is to be had only to the validity of the warrant which he holds from his constituents; 2. That the central assembly has an unquestionable right to declare a deputy inadmissible on the ground of his being disqualified for membership of the association; 3. That such a decision can only be come to in the year next after the objection is raised, and after referring the case to the association which he represents." This compromise, which prevented Dr. Rupp's exclusion, and adjourned the question to another year, was adopted by a majority of sixty-six against eight votes; a result which is accounted for in a great measure by the fact, that shortly after Dr. Rupp sent in his resignation, and so gave the substantial question the go by, not only for the ensuing year, but probably for ever.

*ITALY.—Progress of Mariolatry. The Doctrine of Development.*—We have repeatedly taken occasion to draw attention to the progress which the worship of the Virgin is making in the Romish Church, to the all but exclusion of the mediation of Christ Himself from the popular creed of the Romanists. The promoters of this rampant corruption of Christianity, encouraged by the success which has attended their efforts, are now contemplating an important step in advance, which, if it be accomplished, as to all appearance it will be, will set the seal of authority in a manner hitherto unprecedented upon the widely-spread Ma-

riolatriy of the Romish Communion. The step in contemplation is no less than an authoritative decision of the pope, making the doctrine of the immaculate Conception of the Virgin an article of faith. The importance of such a decision, dating the commencement of the work of man's redemption, not from the incarnation of our blessed Lord, but from the alleged immaculate conception of Mary as the first of the race of Adam who was exempted from the stain of original sin,—a decision which will give a countenance that has hitherto been wanting, to the most blasphemous extravagances connected with the worship of the Virgin,—is at once evident. As a preliminary step to the attainment of this object, a feeler has been put forth at Rome itself, in the shape of a treatise, the author of which is no less a personage than the learned Jesuit John Perrone. The title of it, "*De Immaculato B. V. Mariæ Conceptu, an dogmatico decreto definiri possit? Disquisitio theologica*," at once indicates the drift of the work; and not less significant is the fact, that it is dedicated to Pius IX. But this is not all. The question thus mooted at Rome has been taken up in France, where the *Ami de la Religion* has devoted to it six successive articles, penned by another Jesuit, Father Felix, the manifest object of which is to elicit such an expression of public opinion, as may justify Pius IX. in giving the desired decision; which, being pronounced *ex cathedra*, and acquiesced in by the episcopate, would have the effect of constituting the doctrine in question an article of the faith. As the articles in the *Ami de la Religion*, though assuming the form of a literary critique, are, in fact, of a directly practical tendency, we cannot do better than give a short abstract of them, with a view to enable our readers to form their own opinion of the state of the question, and of the light in which it is regarded, at this time, in the Romish Church; the more so, as their appearance in the official organ of the French episcopate is in itself a circumstance of great weight.

At the very outset, Father Felix points out the distinctly practical character of Perrone's book: "the special subject of the work is, what we shall with Father Perrone, somewhat Latinizing, call the *definibility* of the Immaculate Conception." Nevertheless there is a first, or "historico-critical" part, in which the history of the controversy to which the doctrine has given rise, is briefly reviewed; the main question of the work being treated in a second, or *theologico-critical* part, in which Perrone, "after examining carefully the conditions necessary for the solemn declaration of a verity of the faith, applies the result of his researches to the subject in hand, and unhesitatingly pronounces that the Immaculate Conception may become an article of faith, seeing that all the conditions requisite for a dogmatic definition are united in regard to it."

How far the sentiment which underlies the enthusiastic worship of the Virgin, is allied to other than religious feelings, may be gathered from the following passage, which occurs incidentally in the course of the observations of Father Felix on the manner in which Perrone has

handled his subject. "Let us not be afraid to say it; in this discussion, more perhaps than in any other, every thing has been made a weapon of; the heart entering thoroughly into the debate, has too often done a holy violence to principles. Who does not know that when love acts the logician, conclusions rush in from all sides? Perrone, whose heart evidently has inspired his book, silences his affections with an effort of impartiality for which science must be beholden to him; the man who loves, gives way to the man who reasons; and the servant of Mary is subject to the theologian."

Passing on to the point at which both he and Perrone are evidently driving, Father Felix says, "Who does not see the decisive importance, and the quite providential character which this discussion derives from the time when, and the circumstances under which it is started? It is the character of works destined to strike home, and to leave a deep trace behind them, that they appear at the precise moment when the thought which they unfold is at the bottom of men's minds. The question which the man of providence proposes in public, has by millions of men been silently mooted in the sight of God; accordingly, when that man, opening a vent for a common tendency, and taking resolutely the initiative, expresses the thought of all, the world is on the alert, and expects something. In this point of view the work of Father Perrone, whatever may be its theological importance, appears to us providential. The author will refuse to ascribe to his work an importance which it never possessed in his mind; and yet, perhaps, we should not be venturing too far, if we affirmed that this little book is the harbinger of a great thing which God has in store for us. . . . Is it not, indeed, evident to every one that lives at all in the religious element, that the voice of the theologian is in this case nothing more than the organ of the general voice, the echo of a whole world? Who is there amongst us, whose mind and heart has not been pre-occupied by this matter? Who is there amongst us, that has not, while recounting in devout meditation to himself the glories and triumphs of Mary, desired sometimes in filial aspiration this new glorification for his mother? More than that, this glorification of the spotless Virgin has already ceased to be a simple wish; men whose thought reaches forward as far as their heart, have had that kind of secret revelation of it which results from presentiment; and with that prophetic instinct which God bestows upon chosen souls, they have fancied they saw in a beautiful dream the pontiff, whose throne is in the Vatican, proclaiming, amidst a shout of universal acclamation, Mary to be the Immaculate One. . . . This thought is to be met with wherever there are souls burning with ardour for the Catholic cause, hearts inflamed with saintly passion for the glory of Mary; the thought is truly a living thought, for it lives in every rank of the Catholic world; it lives, we know it does, in the exalted ranks of the hierarchy; and if the wish of the episcopate has not yet reached the pontifical throne, in the form of an official and unanimous demand, the sentiment of the episcopate can no longer be a mystery; since our most illustrious prelates have earnestly

deserved the honour of being cursed !  
 murs ? No one will attempt to deny  
*Archiconfrérie*, that work upon which  
 signally set in its origin, its developm  
 which it is impossible to deny without  
 have actually taken place, and stupidly  
 evidence. Well then ; look ! what is  
 the hand of God in the midst of the cor  
 thing ; the immaculate heart of Mary !  
 assemblies, where sympathetic piety a  
 raise up again, in the midst of a world  
 ful faith of our fathers, listen ! what cry  
 so many hearts filled with emotion ?  
 pray for us, who take refuge with thee  
 from the small church of *Notre-Dame* a  
 associated fraternities, rises to heaven to  
 sides blessing descends, and grace con  
 verting, triumphing grace ; and on all  
 open, and yields up its victims to the na  
 miracles be a language, and an infallible  
 Mary, in responding to the invocations o  
 wonders, speak loud enough ? And whe  
 us a pontiff, who has all his life been d  
 Immaculate Virgin, does it not seem to  
 his Holy Mother to awaken our presenti  
 hopes ?"

Father Felix next reviews the reform  
 has engaged himself, and dwells upon the  
 task which he has undertaken.

the Immaculate Conception? What *palladium*, indeed, is more sacred? what shield better suited to defend the liberties of the nations, than this living ark, from which the liberator of the world came forth? If we are rightly informed, this counsel of God has more than once visited the head of the Church upon his throne. Besides, the very dedication of this book, addressed to the pontiff himself, by a man who writes, so to speak, under the very eyes of Pius IX., and in a city which is wholly filled by his great soul, seems to tell us distinctly enough that this thought may fearlessly knock at the gate of the Vatican, well assured that there it shall meet with a smile from the lips of the pontiff. And how do we know that his wisdom is not at this moment waiting for the solemn manifestation of the mind of the episcopate, in order to give, at length, to a belief which is in the souls of all, the immutable sanction of a dogmatic verity?"

In tracing the history of the controversy respecting the Immaculate Conception, through the former part of Perrone's book, Father Felix proceeds upon the principle that "the peaceful reign of belief always precedes in the Church the noise of the controversies which time brings on;" and he considers the opposition which the doctrine in question had to encounter, as a providential preparation for the glory of the triumph which was to follow. The victory, in his opinion, was complete, when, in December, 1843, the general of the Dominicans, the great opponents of the doctrine, "solicited at Rome, on behalf of his order, the privilege of celebrating, *juxta proprium ritum*, the feast of the Immaculate Conception; and of chanting in the preface, in the sanctuaries of the order, that word, against which their learning and their eloquence had so often risen in arms."

Then comes the main point of the question; the apparent difficulty of introducing a new verity into the creed. "What!" so the objection is worded,—“you mean to decree faith, to create doctrine, to make truth to commence from such a day of such a year.” “Such,” continues Father Felix, “is the stumbling-block of ignorance, at which the heresy and the unbelief of our days still stumble.” To get rid of this stumbling-block, he propounds a doctrine which, if it is not the famous doctrine of development, is as like it “as two peas.” In doing this, he falls back, in order to avoid the charge of novelty, upon Father Suarez, another worthy of the Jesuit order, and one of its notable casuists, who asserts it as “a truth that a proposition may now be believed *explicitly* as a matter of faith, which formerly was not *explicitly* believed by the Church, although it was *implicitly* contained in the ancient doctrine.” Upon the strength of this authority, Father Felix grows quite eloquent in his advocacy of the doctrine of development: “What is to hinder that focus of light, which God has placed at the centre of His Church, from arriving gradually at its perfect radiation? . . . Why should not our dogma, without losing its identity, develop itself and increase in its own way? . . . ‘What!’ it will be said, ‘development in her who is immutable, and the progress of time in the heart of her who is un-

changeable !' And, pray, why not ? No doubt, in order to give to the Catholic dogma its immutable character, it was necessary that that dogma should be born all complete, formed at one single cast. And might not, then, Providence, which has its own hour for every thing, adjourn its full manifestation ? And since it was to come to pass some day, that science should reproach Catholicism for shutting up the human mind within a stationary dogma, was it not expedient to provide for our dogmatic unity successive developments, in order to show to the world, how it is at once immutable and progressive ?"

From Suarez, Father Felix goes back to *Vincentius Lirinensis*, whom he presses into his service as a witness for the doctrine of development, and lays it down, in conclusion, as an undoubted truth, "that the Catholic symbol may grow in extent, in proportion as the Church, by her infallible authority, adds to the number of formally defined verities ; and that, consequently, a revealed verity, which never formed part of the symbol, properly speaking, may, by a providential train of circumstances, be placed in conditions which warrant the holy Catholic Church in setting upon it the immutable seal of a definite dogma."

To follow Father Felix through the mazes of sophistry, through which, starting from the admission that, "in Scripture the belief in the immaculate conception is not revealed with the clearness of evidence," he lands at the assertion, that "the Church had that belief in her cradle," and that therefore "it was a thought derived along with the word of revelation from the bosom of God," would be foreign to our office in these pages, which is to place passing facts on record. Among the facts which, in the discharge of that office, we have occasion to note from time to time, few have been more significant, bearing as they do upon the new character in which popery is about to exhibit itself to an astonished world, than the undisguised adoption, in one of the leading official organs of Romanism, of the doctrine of development, and the direct proposal to convert into an article of faith a dogma which, on account of the many and gross superstitions to which it has given rise, was intolerable even while it was only tolerated as a controverted and doubtful proposition. We make no apology, therefore, for transferring to our pages such a tissue of blasphemies and sophistries ; as times go, no better service can be rendered to the Church and the people of England, than to make it perfectly clear and tangible, what sort of Christianity that is which clamours for unlimited licence to run riot in the land, and openly avows its design to supplant the faith and worship of the English Church. It only remains for us now to furnish our readers with such data as are extant, touching the view likely to be taken by Pius IX. of the suggestions of Fathers Perrone and Felix.

In reference to this point, the history of the pontificate of Pius IX., short as it is, would furnish numerous instances of the conspicuous part which he has personally taken on all occasions, in the celebration of the superstitious solemnities connected with the worship of the Virgin ; by which he has given to the Mariolatry of the Roman Church, all the



weight and splendour which his personal countenance and presence can give. To collect all the notices of this kind would, however, be a tedious and unprofitable task. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with having pointed out this head of evidence; and we shall conclude by subjoining two documents which speak for themselves. One of them is an official circular published on the 26th of July last, which directs the thanksgivings of the subjects of Pius IX. for their happy deliverance from the danger of civil broils to be addressed to the Virgin. It runs thus:—

“The inhabitants of the Pontifical States and of the city of Rome, owe a special devotion to the holy Virgin, the help of Christians; to her they are to fly in all tribulations; since at all times, and day by day, they have experienced the salutary effects of her protection. The day being at hand when the Church celebrates the feast of Mary’s Assumption, his Holiness, our sovereign, penetrated towards the Queen of angels with sentiments of special piety, lively gratitude, and firm confidence, desires to give to his religious people a new opportunity of turning, under the merciful circumstances of the moment, to the Mother of love and compassion, not only with thanksgivings for her unceasing benefits, but with the prayer that she may be further gracious unto us, and avert from us the punishments which the Divine justice has been provoked to inflict upon us for our sins. The holy Father therefore commands that in all the dioceses of his states solemn public prayers shall during nine days precede the feast of Mary’s Assumption, or that at least the octave shall be celebrated in the churches appointed for this purpose by the ordinaries; and he grants, for this end, to all confessors licensed at present, generally and specially, all those spiritual powers which he declared for the jubilee, published by him on the 20th of November, 1846. Rome, 26th July, 1847. Signed: Cardinal ORIOLI.”

The second document to which we desire to call our readers’ attention, in connexion with this subject, is the brief addressed by Pius IX. to Father Perrone, on the 25th of October last, and published in the *Diario*, in which, before he has had time to read the work itself, he not only highly compliments its author, but expresses his approbation of the subject of it, and of its dedication to himself, in the following terms:—“Nothing is more pleasing to us, or more desired by us, than to see worship, piety, and veneration towards the most holy Mother of God, the tender Mother of all, the immaculate Virgin Mary, increase more and more every where, and to hear every voice proclaim worthily her praises. Hence you may judge, dearly beloved son, with what satisfaction of heart we have received the theological dissertation on the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, composed by you in Latin, recently issued from the presses of Rome, and dedicated to us.”

Mariolatry, Jesuitism, Radicalism, these are the things whereof Pius IX., the idol of his Church, and the admiration of a thoughtless world, is the personification.

*The Pope and the Jesuits.*—In our last number we furnished strong

evidence of the fact, which we never doubted, that the most perfect understanding subsists between Pius IX. and the Jesuits, and that the latter are entering heart and soul into the new system of papal policy. As there are parties who still disbelieve, or affect to disbelieve, the existence of this "*entente cordiale*," we add to the proofs already given others still more conclusive. A rumour, recently accredited by the radical press in France, that the pope contemplated the dissolution of the Jesuit order, has elicited from the Romish organs in France counter-statements couched in the strongest terms.

"Upon his accession," says the *Univers*, "our holy and magnanimous pontiff Pius IX. proclaimed the religious orders to be 'chosen bands, auxiliary columns, soldiers of Jesus Christ, who have at all times been a mighty help, an ornament, and a defence to Christian society.' The Jesuits have, like all the other orders, had their share in this eulogy, from which they were not excepted; but which has, on the contrary, been confirmed, as regards them, by repeated manifestations of paternal good-will."

"The pretended intelligence in question," says the *Ami de la Religion*, in allusion to the rumour above mentioned, "appeared to us so absurd, that we did not even think it worth while to contradict it; but as it has been reproduced by several journals, and as nothing is too absurd to find credence with certain parties, precisely because it is incredible, we beg to assure both the friends and the enemies of religion, that it is simply an audacious lie. No, the dreams of the *phalanstère* have nothing in common with the positive and reforming wisdom of our holy and magnanimous pontiff, Pius IX. And the head of the Church, who but a short time ago proclaimed the religious orders to be 'chosen bands, auxiliary columns, soldiers of Jesus Christ, who have at all times been a mighty help, an ornament and a defence both to civil and Christian society,' is supposed now to contemplate, for the sake of gratifying the enemies of religion, the destruction, from among those valiant bodies of militia, of the society of Jesus, to which he has been pleased, up to this day, to give marks of such paternal kindness! Surely no one will believe this!"

The passage somewhat inaccurately quoted by both these journals, is taken from the encyclic of Pius IX. to the superiors of the monastic orders, mentioned in our last<sup>6</sup>. That document, dated June 17, 1847, opens with the following declaration:—"Scarcely had we, by a secret design of Providence, been raised to the government of the Universal Church, than we felt, among the great obligations and heavy cares of our apostolic ministry, none so near our heart as that of expressing towards your families of religious men the most particularly affectionate sentiments of our paternal love, of testifying to them our good will, of protecting and defending them, and endeavouring with all our might to advance their welfare and their splendour. Indeed, having been established by most holy men, inspired by the Holy Ghost,

<sup>6</sup> See p. 251.

with a view to the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls, and having been confirmed by the Apostolic See, they contribute, by the multiplicity of their forms, to that admirable variety which sheds a wonderful lustre upon the Church; and they constitute those chosen hands, those auxiliary columns of soldiers of Jesus Christ, which have at all times been a mighty help, an ornament and a defence to civil as well as to Christian society. Their members, called by a special grace of God to practise the counsels of evangelic wisdom, esteeming nothing comparable to the sublime knowledge of Jesus Christ, despising with greatness of soul and with an invincible heart earthly things, in order to consider only heavenly things, have shown themselves constantly engaged in those eminent works and glorious labours, by which they have so well deserved of the Catholic Church and of the temporal governments."

We have not room to follow his Holiness into the details of his eulogical enumeration of the spiritual achievements of the religious orders; the above extract will suffice to show in what estimation the system which has always supplied the Roman usurpation with its most effective militia, is held by the present clear-sighted occupant of the "chair of St. Peter." We shall now lay before our readers a few extracts from a letter addressed by the reverend Father Roothaan to the editor of the *Courrier Français*, only premising, that the fact of a liberal French newspaper being honoured with the autograph correspondence of the general of the Jesuits, is itself a not insignificant sign of the times. The letter is dated from Rome, September 14th, 1847, and is a protest against the assertion advanced by a correspondent of the *Courrier*, that "the Jesuit and retrograde party were engaged in a permanent conspiracy against Pius IX." In reply to this and other similar accusations, Father Roothaan disclaims on the part of his order all connexion with politics, and all party associations. "The true Jesuits," he says, "that is, the members of the Society of Jesus, are nowhere party men. Our society is a religious order solemnly approved by the Church; its sole object is that set forth in its institute, viz. the glory of God and the salvation of souls; the means it employs are the practice of the evangelic counsels, and the zeal of which the apostles and apostolic men in all ages have set it the example; it knows of no other. Politics are foreign to it; it has never linked its fate with any party whatever. Its mission is greater and superior to all parties. The obedient daughter of the Church, the institute is at her service whenever she is willing to employ it. . . ."

"Like the Church, the Society of Jesus feels for the political constitution of different states neither antipathy nor predilection. Its members sincerely accept the form of government under which Providence places them; no matter whether a friendly power gives them encouragement, or whether it goes no further than to respect in them the rights which it recognizes as belonging to other citizens. If the political institutions of the country where the society dwells are defective, its members endure their defects; if they are improved, they applaud their

amelioration ; if by those institutions new rights are proclaimed for the people, they claim the benefit of them for themselves ; if the ways of liberty are enlarged, they take the advantage of it for the purpose of giving to their works of beneficence and zeal a wider scope. Everywhere they accommodate themselves to the level of the laws ; they respect the public authorities ; they adopt all the sentiments of good and loyal citizens ; they share their burthens, their toils and enjoyments. The reason is, that in the eyes of the Jesuits, one supreme interest dominates over every other interest, the happiness of mankind in a better and more durable life. Wherever this end can be attained, the Jesuits naturalize themselves without reluctance and without difficulty. Such are the principles of the Jesuits in reference to the governments and their different political institutions." . . .

After this declaration of political neutrality, the general goes on to vouch for the unfailing allegiance of his order to the Roman pontiff.

" With regard to the supreme head of the Church, the Jesuits consider themselves bound by much stricter obligations. They believe that they owe him a much larger share of their affections and their devotion. In their eyes the sovereign pontiff is not merely a temporal prince to whom they owe submission and respect ; he is to them above all a father, and the representative of Jesus Christ. Upon this account he receives from the Jesuits most special marks of veneration. All the acts which emanate from his authority are received by them with love. Such measures as he thinks fit to take for the administration of his states, they approve and defend ; his counsels are to them commands ; and the greatest misfortune to them would be to grieve his paternal heart. . . .

" It is as contrary to truth as to public notoriety, that the Jesuits are in a state of permanent conspiracy against the august pontiff, whom the whole universe greets with its acclamations. To love, to venerate, to bless, and to defend Pope Pius IX., to obey him in all things, to applaud the wise reforms and improvements which it shall please him to introduce, is with all the Jesuits a duty both in conscience and in law, which it will always be pleasant to them to fulfil. This duty, which all the subjects of the Roman states have in common, will be the more easy of fulfilment, as the holy pontiff who at present fills the chair of Peter, combines with the sacred character with which he is invested, all the virtues which the Church honours, and all the great qualities which the world admires. With the Jesuits in particular, that duty will moreover be a duty of gratitude, since from the day when Pius IX. placed the triple crown on his head, he has not ceased to give the Society of Jesus pledges of his benevolent and paternal affection."

As if on purpose to complete the documentary evidence of the intimate alliance and mutual good-will at this time of Popery and Jesuitism, Pius IX., in a letter addressed on the 25th of October last to one of the members of the order, Father Perrone, which has been already referred to, has taken occasion to speak of the society to which he belongs, in terms which must remove all doubt, if any could remain.

After eulogizing the merit of the individual Jesuit to whom the letter is addressed, Pius IX. thus continues:—

“Such merit does not surprise us in a member of that illustrious society, which is justly proud of having produced so many men celebrated for the integrity of their lives, for the glory of their sanctity, for their devotion to the Catholic religion, for every kind of learning, and for the distinguished services which they have rendered to Christian and to civil society.”

*Policy of Pope Pius IX. Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem.*—Among the measures adopted by Pius IX. which indicate his determination to push in every direction the claim of his see to universal spiritual dominion, is the appointment of a new Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem, which took place in the secret consistory of October 4. Since the first establishment of this patriarchate, by Innocent III., in the fourth Lateran Council, there has been a regular succession of patriarchs, but the appointment has for a long time been merely nominal, the patriarchs not being called upon to reside, in consequence of the occupation of the holy city by the Turks. In the allocution which he addressed to the consistory on the occasion, Pius IX., after briefly recounting the history of the patriarchate, thus states his views both on this subject, and on the general character of his policy.

“Through exceeding solicitude for that portion of the Lord’s flock, and through deep and pious attachment to those localities, we had from the very commencement of our pontificate nothing more earnestly at heart, than to see the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem again residing on his see. Seeing, therefore, that with the help of God, and agreeably to our anxious wish, all difficulties have been removed, and that there is now nothing to prevent the patriarch from taking charge of his church on the spot itself, we have thought fit without further delay to bring the matter to the wished for conclusion, for the increase of God’s glory and the benefit of the faithful in those parts. Wherefore we procured this important business to be dispatched according to the prudent advice of our congregation *de Propagandâ fide*, and issued our Apostolic Letter on the 23rd of July of this present year, sealed with the fisherman’s ring, in which we have explained the whole matter. And forasmuch as our venerable brother Daulus Augustus Foscolo, who was in possession of the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem, has abdicated the same, and we, receiving and approving such abdication, have absolved this our venerable brother from the tie by which he was bound to the Church at Jerusalem, we thought fit to proceed to the election of a new patriarch. Therefore we determined, with the advice of the said congregation, to elect to the dignity of Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem our beloved son, the Presbyter Joseph Valerga, who is distinguished by his singular integrity, piety, erudition, prudence, and ability for business, and from his heart devoted to the see of St. Peter; who has already filled with great success the office of missionary in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia, and has conducted, with no less cleverness than diligence, affairs of importance to the Catholic cause, with which he has been

entrusted. Wherefore we cherish the hope that, being endowed with such excellent gifts, he will, in reliance upon the help of Heaven, bring them to bear upon his patriarchate, and with increased alacrity and zeal display and employ them especially for the advancement of the Catholic religion, and for the benefit of the people committed to his charge. This is, venerable brethren, what I thought good to communicate to you, being well persuaded that you will, together with us, address to God most good and most mighty, diligent and fervent supplications with thanksgivings, that, graciously inclining his ear to our common prayers, he may by his Divine grace cause the Catholic faith to increase daily more and more, to grow mightily, and to flourish with good success in those regions where the Christian sojourner is instructed in the knowledge of the power of the Gospel, not only by written records, but by the evidence of the very places where he dwells.

“And here, venerable brethren, we declare distinctly and openly, that both in this and in every other matter, *all our cares, thoughts, and endeavours, altogether foreign to any system whatsoever of human policy, are directed to this end, that the most holy faith and doctrine of Christ may shine forth with greater and greater brightness among all the nations upon the face of the earth.* For, although it is our wish that princes to whom power is committed by God, should, turning away their ears from fraudulent and pernicious counsels, observing the rule of justice, walking agreeably to the will of God, and *protecting the rights and liberties of his holy Church*, incessantly promote the happiness and welfare of their people, with all godliness and kindness, yet we are much grieved, on the other hand, to find that there are in divers places certain of the people who, audaciously abusing our name, and inflicting a most deep injury upon our person and supreme dignity, venture to refuse the subjection due from them to their princes, and to excite against them troubles and unlawful commotions. Which is so manifestly abhorrent from our intentions, that, on the contrary, in our encyclic addressed to all our venerable brethren, the bishops, on the ninth day of November in the year last past, we did not fail to inculcate due obedience towards princes and powers; from which obedience, according to the commandment of the Christian law, no one can ever depart without sin, *except, of course, if any thing should be enjoined which is contrary to the laws of God and of the Church.*”



# INDEX

OF THE

## REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

*Alexandria*, history of the Patriarchate of, by Neale, 213; revolution in Egypt, 214; its analogy to English history, 215; remarkable history of a Patriarch of Alexandria, 216.

*Allies*, Mr., his work in Defence of the Church of England against the charge of schism, 106; importance of the question of the papal supremacy, *ib.*; Mr. Allies' work possesses a peculiar value, 107; remarks on a certain class of writers, 108; Romish appeal to antiquity, *ib.*; comparison of Ultramontane and Gallican views, 109; Gallican doctrines, 110; contradictions of Romanism, 111.

*Bernis de*, Cardinal, his character, 8.

*Brasses*, Mr. Boutell's work on, 200.

*Britons*, Dr. Giles's work on their history, 470.

*Burial Service*, present state of the law in regard to it, 473.

*Bunting, Jabez*, his influence on Wesleyan Methodism, 322, &c.

*Canterbury*, synod of, in 1847, 302.

*Catholicity*, contradictions of Romanists on this point, 362, 363.

*Ceylon*, state of the Church there, 233; care of the Dutch for religious instruction, 234; predominance of heathenism and popery, 235; defects of the catechist system, 236; nominal Christianity, 237.

*Choiseul, Duke de*, his correspondence on the election of Clement XIV., 9.

*Cromwell*, works of Carlyle and Merle d'Aubigné on, 218.

*Christology*, Dr. Hengstenberg's, 180.

*Church Extension*, its great importance, 141; want of funds at present, 142; an annual Queen's Letter suggested, 143; a society for Church Extension suggested, 144; an increase in the number of bishops requisite, 145; assumptions of the Romish hierarchy, 146; Wesleyans look to an Episcopate, 147; increase of sees in America, 148; necessity for exertion on the part of the Church, 149; opposition to an increase in the Episcopate, 150; advance of the diocese of Ripon, 151; Bishop of Ripon's argument for an increase in the Episcopate, 152; his statement of Episcopal duties, 153; views of statesmen on these subjects, 156; a large increase in the Episcopate to be sought for, 157; seats in Parliament, question relating to, 158; object of the Episcopate, 159; origin of chapters, 160; history of canons, 161; alterations in the ancient system, 162; origin of deans of cathedrals, 163; change of discipline, 164; pluralities existing at present, 165; proposal to unite canonries with poorly-endowed benefices, 166; plan applied in London and Westminster, 167; plan carried out

elsewhere, 168; suggested annexation of deaneries to bishoprics, 169; practice in favour of this, 170; advantages of the plan, 171; new sees proposed to be founded, 172, 173; means for endowing new sees, 174; large parochial benefices may be annexed, 175; patronage for new sees how to be provided, 176; necessity of exertion, 177; duty of the Church to exert herself, 178; position of the Church in relation to Romanism and the sects, 179.

*Clement XIV.*, his life, by Crétineau-Joly, 1.

*Clergy*, devotions for the, 205.

*Convocation*, growing opinion in favour of its revival, 289; unsound positions taken by some persons, 290; Parliament an unfit body to legislate for the Church, 291; evils of the disuse of synods, 292; necessity of altering the present system of legislation, 293; difference between ancient and modern Episcopal synods as representations of the Church, 294; probable character of convocation, 295; its assembly would promote amicable relations between Church and State, 296; its tendency to diminish religious party, 297; occasional evils of synods no reason against their use, 298; Convocation should be made a National Convocation, 299; mode in which this might be accomplished, 300; propriety of joining Irish synods to English, 301; proceedings at the opening of Convocation, 302—307; remarks on them, 307; Mr. Denison's and Mr. Trower's pamphlets, 307—310; Mr. Denison's remarks on school deeds, 310, 311; pamphlet by "Ecclesiastes" on "Church Emancipation and Church Reform," 311, 312; his excellent remarks on an increased Episcopate, 312, 313.

*Crétineau-Joly*, his account of Clement XIV. and the Jesuits, 1; remarks of the *Ami de la Religion* on its publication, 1; character of the work, 2; its object to support the Jesuits, 3; doctrines of that society, 4; reasons for publishing the work, 5; documents on which it is founded, 6; deceptive character of this evidence, 7; proceedings of the conclave at the election of Clement XIV., 8; conduct of Cardinal de Bernis, 9; his vanity, *ib.*; his demands for reward, 10; his undignified position, *ib.*; blasphemies of Voltaire, 11; intrigues in the conclave, *ib.*; divisions

of the cardinals, 12; note of d'Aubeterre to De Bernis about Ganganelli, 13; decided conduct of the Spanish cardinals, 14; a promise of suppressing the Jesuits proposed, 14, 15; bribery of some of the cardinals questioned, 17; the question of the corruption of the Albani examined, 18—21; conditions on which Clement XIV. was made pope, 22; character of Ganganelli, 23; his mysterious conduct, 24; Cardinal de Bernis mystified to the last, 25; remarks on the way in which the election was carried, 26; promise made by Clement XIV. to abolish the Jesuit order, 27; his conduct in suppressing that order described, 28; led to his death by poison, 29; M. Crétineau-Joly's attempt to clear the Jesuits, 30, 31; inconsistency of the Jesuit views of Clement XIV. with the theory of the papal power, 32; miracle of Alphonso di Liguori, 33; practical conclusion, 34.

*D'Aubeterre, M.*, his note to Cardinal de Bernis, 8. 13.

*Down and Connor*, antiquities of, by Mr. Reeves, 194.

*Dublin*, archbishop of, his remarks on the bill for restoring bishoprics in Ireland, 273.

*France*, adhesion of the French Episcopate to the liberalism of Pius IX., 489; collection in aid of the pope's finances, *ib.*; taken up by the *Ami de la Religion*, 491; society formed for the conversion of "Oceanla," *ib.*

— expenses of the Ecclesiastical Establishment there, 238; its increase, 239; augmentation since the Restoration, 240; educational statistics, 241.

*Germany*, development of rationalism in Germany, 492; conduct of the "Free Evangelic Church," 493; movements at Halle under Wislicenus, 494; blasphemies of this sect, 495; proceedings of Pastor Uhlich, 496; his appeal to the king of Prussia, 497; suspended by the consistory from his office, 498; deposed, 499; subsequent proceedings, 500; Gustavus Adolphus association, 501.

— limitation of political rights by religious tests there, 242; only Christians admitted to the legislature, 244, 245.

*Glass-painting*, remarks on, 200.

*Godolphin*, Mrs., her life, by Evelyn, 400; remarks on religious tales, 402; remarks on "Margaret Perceval," 403; Mrs. Godolphin's parentage, 404; her appointment at court, 405; her rules of life, 406; difficulties of her position, 407; Evelyn's testimony to her conduct, 408; her religious conversation, 409; avoidance of over-severity, 410; her religious isolation, 411; her acquaintance with Evelyn, 412; her formation of friendship with him, 413; stratagem to secure early rising, 414; her holy life, 415; her good offices to others, 416, 417; remarks on playing at cards, 418; benefits of her example, 419; uses of religious houses, 420; resigns her post, 421; her desires for a single life, 422; called back to court, 423; married to Mr. Godolphin, 424; her visit to France, 425; her life in the married state, 426; her death, 427.

*Greek Church*, society formed by Romanists for its conversion, 252; conversions to this Church in Poland and the Baltic provinces, 254; edicts on the subject, 255.

*Gurney*, Mr. Archer, his criticism on Mr. R. Montgomery's Poems, 485.

*Guthlac*, St., his life, 468, 469.

*Hampden*, Rev. Dr., publications on his appointment to a bishopric, 430; union of the Church produced by it, 431; Dr. Hampden's views, 432; remarks on the conduct of the minister, 433; movement in the Church against Dr. Hampden's appointment, 434; injustice of imputations of Dr. Hampden and his friends on this movement, 435; extracts from Dr. Hampden's letter, 436, 437; extracts from his former writings, 438; protest of the bishops, 439; reply of Lord John Russell, 440; Bishop of Exeter's letter, 441; creed of prime ministers on Church appointments, 442; Crown appointment to Episcopal sees, 443; the Crown never had any absolute power of appointing till time of Henry VIII., 444; necessity of petitioning Parliament, 445; appointment to sees without parliamentary seats need not belong to Crown, 446; patronage of bishoprics not necessary to the Government, 447; duties of bishops, 448; exertion recommended, 449; the Church still powerful, if she will exert her power, 450; union of parties recommended,

451; probable success of exertions for the Church, 452; our great desideratum is *action*, 453; wisdom of following the example of the sects, 454; need of petitions, 455.

*India*, support of idolatry there by the English Government, 246, 247.

*Ireland*, its condition from the time of Henry II. to that of James II., 258; state of Irish society in the last century, *ib.*; contrasted with the present state, 259; adventures of Freney, the robber, 260; duels in Ireland, 261; Pat Power of Daragle, and Bryan Maguire, noted duellists, 262; murders committed in Ireland, 263; a permanently coercive government required for Ireland, 264; mistake in the English system of ruling Ireland, 265; evils of this system, 266; permanent weakness of the Irish Government, 267; the Church of Ireland, its conduct, 268; Dr. Miller's publication on the Church Education Society, 269; the Church of Ireland cannot recede, 270; extracts from Dr. Miller's work, 271; suppression of bishoprics in Ireland, 272; Archbishop of Dublin's charge in reference to the bill introduced for restoring Irish bishoprics, 273; his arguments for that measure, 274, 275; necessity for restoring suppressed sees, 276.

*Italy*, the policy of the papacy there, 248. — progress of Mariolatry, 501; Perrone's work on the Virgin, 502; Father Felix on the Virgin, 503; his remarks on the appeal of Pius IX. to the Virgin, 504; his history of the Immaculate Conception, 505; his adoption of the development theory, 506; Papal worship of the Virgin, 507; Papal connexion with the Jesuits, *ib.*; letter of Father Roothaan to the *Courrier Français*, 509; letter of the pope to Perrone, 510; policy of Pius IX. and the Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem, 511, 512.

*Kara Georg*, his origin, 86.

*Kerr*, Mrs., her translation of Ranke's history of Servia, 74.

*Liguori*, Alphonso di, a pretended miracle of his, 33.

*Lord*, Mr., his curious views on prophecy, 193, 194.

*Love*, Mr., his work on Wesleyan Methodism, 141.

*Lucius*, King, the fable of his conversion to Christianity examined; 471, 472.

*Marriage*, laws of, danger of interfering with them, 485—487.

*Methodism*, its description, 314; its violation of the principles of Wesley, 315; passages from his writings, *ib.*; explanation of these passages by Methodists, 316; letters of orders issued by Wesley, 317; in direct contradiction to his own principles, 318; his Jesuitism, 319; his inconsistency, 320; his abuse of the Church, 321; influence of Dr. Jabez Bunting, 322; "Deed of Declaration," its importance, 323, 324; its despotic character, 324; jealousy of popular movements manifested by the Conference, 325; impediments in the way of petitioning, 326, 327; alterations in the system made by Conference, 327, 328; theological institution proposed by Dr. Bunting, 329; plan of this seminary, 330; establishment of the institution, 331; Wesleyan forms of ordination, 332; curious discussion on this subject at the Wesleyan Conference, 333, 334; difficulties as to ordination, 335; inconsistency with the principles of Wesley, 336; shocking character of the Wesleyan ordination office, 337; its absurdity, 338—340; tests of orthodoxy in Wesleyanism, 340; the loose nature of the Wesleyan belief, 341; danger of Unitarianism, 342; unsoundness of doctrine, 343; other questionable points, 344; doctrine of "perfection," 345; value of "revivals," 346; advice to class-leaders, 347; analogy between Methodism and Popery, 348; Methodist statistics, 349; dangers of Methodism, 351; Wesleyanism condemned by itself, 352, 353.

*Miller*, Rev. Dr., his pamphlet on Church education in Ireland, 269.

*Milosch*, his rise, 94.

*Montgomery*, Mrs. Alfred, her poems, 456.

*Norton*, Mr., his inconsistency in objecting to Rationalism, 191.

*Olshausen*, Dr., translation of his Commentary, by Loewe, badly executed, 462, &c.

*Oxford*, guide for visitors to, 220.

*Paton*, Mr., his travels in Servia, 74.

*Pelle*, Rev. Dr., his Annotations on St.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 277; ancient commentators contrasted with modern, 278; common faults in commentators, 275; Dr. Pelle's dealings with Calvinism, 280, 281; selected illustrations of his annotations, 283—287; importance of study of the Greek text, 288.

"*Perceval*, Margaret," remarks on the tale of, 403.

*Pereira*, his work on the Papal Supremacy, 107; his history, 113; his principles on the Episcopate, 114; summary of his argument, 115; continued, 116; the power of bishops absolute, 117; in their own dioceses, 118; these principles justify the English Reformation, 119; Gallican principles subject the Pope to the Church, 120; texts interpreted by the Fathers in opposition to Church of Rome, 121; principles of Gallicanism fatal to Rome, 122; these principles recognized in Romanism, 123; adulation of the Papacy, 124; the Pope called God, 125; Romish explanations of this, 126; remarks on Romish idolatry, 127; important principle laid down by Pereira, 128; lawfulness of suspending Papal jurisdiction, 129, 130; difficulty raised by Mr. Froude, 131; suspension of Papal jurisdiction in France, 132; the Church of Rome has been in fact divided, 133; great western schism, 134; present notions of Romanists, 135; conduct of Romish Sovereigns in preventing intercourse with Rome, 136; the notion of a divided Church considered, 137, 138; the sin of schism, 139; Romish theories examined, 140.

*Pius IX.*, his policy to court democracy, 248; his compliments to France, 249; his plans of reform in patronage, 251; his favour to the Jesuits, 251; address of the Jews to him, 253.

"*Priest of the order of charity*," his high notions of Papal power, 354, 355; his contradictory doctrine, 356; his Gallicism, 357.

*Ranké*, his history of Servia, 77.

*Ripon*, Bishop of, his argument for more bishops, 152.

*Ritual of the English Church*, Mr. Maskell's works on it, 195.

*Rosary*, remarks on the, 209.

*Schism*, the great western, its history, 365; Papal power in the 14th cen-

- tury, 366; return of Pope Gregory XI. to Rome from Avignon, 367; death of the Pontiff, 368; election of Urban VI., 369; his deposal by the Cardinals, *ib.*; their election of Clement VII., 370; election of the Pontiffs examined by Sovereigns, 371; Urban deposes Joanna of Naples, 372; conduct of Prignano, 373; crusades against the Clementine party, 374; disputes between the two "Obediences," 375; "Saints" on each side, 376; disposal of patronage, 377; torture of his Cardinals by Urban, 378; their murder, 379; attempts to reduce the Church to one obedience, 380; Laws against Papacy in England, 381; both parties labour for unity, 382; proposals of University of Paris, 383; inconsistency of their principles, 384; Pope Benedict refuses to resign the Papacy, 385; attempts to compel him by force, 386; Pope Boniface guilty of Simony, 387; resistance of the Cardinals to Gregory XII., 388; quarrel of Clementines with their Pope, 389; inconsistency with Romish principles, 390; Council of Pisa, inconsistency of its principles, 391; accepted by the majority of the Western Church, 392; difficulties of Romanists on those points, 393; inconsistency with Romish principles at the present day, 394, 395; dilemma of Romanism, 396; reason for the theories adopted by new converts, 397; difficulties of the case, 398; reflections on Romish position, 399.
- Scotland*, Ecclesiastical History of, 50; discipline regarding the observance of the Lord's Day, 50; regulations of the Kirk Session of Aberdeen on this, 51; interference with the Laids and Nobility, 52; outrages on the Sabbath Day frequent, 53; modes of penance practised after the Reformation, 54; severity of penances, 55; cursing, swearing, and witchcraft punished, 56; also popery, 57; forms of excommunication, 58; excommunication of the Laird of Gicht, 59; intercourse with Papists prohibited, 59; examination of the instruction of young persons of rank, 60; strictness in expelling Popish books and symbols, 61; story of the Lady of Frendraught, 62; political offences visited with excommunication, 63; conversions to Popery, 64; dispute between the Town Council and Kirk Session of Aberdeen, 65; its result, 66; regulations as to catechizing, 67; directions
- about mendicants, 68; mode in which the affairs of a Presbytery are conducted, 69; regulations as to the appointment of additional ministers, 70; Episcopacy in Scotland, 71; service in the Churches under Episcopacy, *ib.*
- Servia*, travels in, by Mr. Paton, 74; the question of Servian independence, 75; character of Mr. Paton's work, 76; and of the history of Servia, *ib.*; origin of the Servians, 77, 78; attempts of the Greeks to subdue them, 79; origin of the Servian Monarchy, *ib.*; creation of the Servian Patriarch, 80; succession of Servian kings, 81; recovery of the liberty of Servia, 82; its extinction, *ib.*; subjugation to the Mahommedans, 83; Servia under Turkish rule, 84; excesses of Turkish functionaries, 85; rise of Kara Georg, 86; valour of the Servians, 87; their successes, 88; history of the war continued, 89, 90; internal government of Kara Georg, 91; successful resistance to Turkey, 92; treaty of Bucharest in 1812, 93; Milosch, his rise, 94; his insurrection against Turkey, 95; is recognized by the Porte as ruler of Servia, 96, 97; subsequent revolution of power, 98; abdication of Milosch, and appointment of the son of Kara Georg, 99; ceremonies observed on Christmas Eve, *ib.*; superstitions of Servia, 100; visit of Mr. Paton to the convent of Tronosha, 101; Servian notions of Christian fellowship, 103; general desire for enlightenment, 104; duty of Christian states to Servia, 105.
- Stirling*, Mr., his work on the philosophy of trade, 35; his inquiry into the relative value of commodities, 36; his view controverted, 37; inquiry into price, 38; Mr. Stirling's view explained, 39; his remarks on the causes and consequences of gluts, 41; his remarks on the nature and value of labour, *ib.*; Adam Smith's and Mr. Ricardo's views, 42; Mr. Stirling's view of profits, 43; his opinions controverted, 44; great importance of demand, 45; theory of rent, *ib.*; views of Malthus and Ricardo, 46; opinions of Mr. Stirling on this subject the basis of system on profits, 47; Mr. Stirling's mistake, 48; character of his work, 49.
- Sutton*, Mr., his extraordinary work, *The Evangel of Love*, 224.
- Thompson*, Mr., his exalted notions of the

Papal power, 357; his language as to unity, 358; his misrepresentations of "Anglican" doctrine, 359; Mr. Thompson admits the doctrine he condemns, 360; his Gallicanism, 361; his doctrine on "Catholicity," 362, 363; supported by the "Dublin Review," 364.

*Unitarians*, their dislike of pure rationalism, 189—192.

*Unity*, inconsistency of Romish theories on this subject, 354—362. See *Schism*.

*Unity of the Church*, Romish theory on this subject, 208.

*Urban VI.*, his election as pope, 369.

*Ventura*, his democratic harangues at Rome, 250.

*Voltaire*, his blasphemies, 11.

THE END OF VOL. VIII.









